THE

CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

No. CXIV.—OCTOBER, 1863.

ART. I.—DR. BUSHNELL'S ARGUMENTS FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

BY REV. IRAH CHASE, D. D., NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.]

I.

ORGANIC CONNECTION.

Dr. Bushnell, in his work on Christian Nurture, lays down the following proposition, namely: That the child is to grow up a Christian, and never know himself as being otherwise. This he immediately modifies by adding: "In other words, the aim, effort and expectation should be, not, as is commonly assumed, that the child is to grow up in sin, to be converted after he comes to a mature age; but that he is to open on the world as one that is spiritually renewed, not remembering the time when he went through a technical experience, but seeming rather to have loved what is good from his earliest years." Exceptions he admits; and he proposes to speak of these in another connection, when they can be stated intelligibly.

After presenting several weighty considerations in support of his proposition, he proceeds thus: "If we narrowly examine the relation of parent and child, we shall not fail to discover something like a law of organic connection, as regards character, subsisting between them;—such a connection as makes it easy to believe, and natural to expect, that

Vol. xxviii.—33.

the faith of the one will be propagated in the other. Perhaps I should rather say, such a connection as induces the conviction that the character of one is actually included in that of the other, as seed is formed in the capsule; and being there matured, by the nutriment derived from the stem, is gradually separated from it. It is a singular fact, that many believe substantially the same thing, in regard to evil character, but have no thought of any such possibility in regard There has been much speculation, of late, as to whether a child is born in depravity, or whether the depraved character is superinduced afterwards. But, like many other great questions, it determines much less than is commonly supposed; for, according to the most proper view of the subject, a child is really not born till he emerges from the infantile state, and never before that time can he be said to receive a separate and properly individual nature.

"The declarations of Scripture and the laws of physiology, I have already intimated, compel the belief that a child's nature is somehow depravated by descent from parents who are under the corrupting effects of sin. But this, taken as a question relating to the mere punctum temporis, or precise point of birth, is not a question of any so grave import as is generally supposed; for the child, after birth, is still within the matrix of the parental life, and will be, more or less, for many years. And the parental life will be flowing into him all that time, just as naturally, and by a law as truly organic, as when the sap of the trunk flows into a limb. We must not govern our thoughts, in such matters, by our eyes; and because the physical separation has taken place, conclude that no organic relation remains. Even the physical being of the child is dependent still for many months, in the matter of nutrition, on organic processes not in itself. Meantime, the mental being and character have scarcely begun to have a proper individual life. Will, in connection with conscience, is the basis of personality, or individuality; and these exist as yet only in their rudimental type, as when the form of a seed is beginning to be unfolded at the root of a flower.

"At first, the child is held as a mere passive lump in the arms, and he opens into conscious life under the soul of the

parent, streaming into his eyes and ears, through the manners and tones of the nursery. The kind and degree of passivity are gradually changed as life advances. A little farther on it is observed that a smile awakens a smile; any kind of sentiment or passion, playing in the face of the parent, wakens a responsive sentiment or passion. Irritation irritates, a frown withers, love expands a look congenial to itself, and why not holy love? Next the ear is opened to the understanding of words; but what words the child shall hear, he cannot choose, and has as little capacity to select the sentiments that are poured into his soul. Farther on, the parents begin to govern him by appeals to will, expressed in commands; and whatever their requirement may be, he can as little withstand it, as the violet can cool the scorching sun, or the tattered leaf can tame the hurricane. Next they appoint his school, choose his books, regulate his company, decide what form of religion, and what religious opinions he shall be taught, by taking him to a church of their own selection. In all this they infringe upon no right of the child; they only fulfil an office which belongs to them. Their will and character are designed to be the matrix of the child's will and character. Meantime he approaches more and more closely, and by a gradual process, to the proper rank and responsibility of an individual creature, during all which process of separation, he is having their exercises and ways translated into him. Then at last he comes forth to act his part in such color of evil, and why not of good, as he has derived from them."

In these passages, it will be perceived, the author begins by representing the relation of parent and child to be "something like a law of organic connection, as regards character, subsisting between them." And this he further defines by adding, "Such a connection as makes it easy to believe, and natural to expect, that the faith of the one will be propagated in the other." Thus far, as the word "propagated" is most frequently used in a figurative sense, the statement seems entitled to a ready admission. But in the very next sentence there is an important modification: "Perhaps I should rather say, such a connection as induces the conviction that the

character of one is actually included in that of the other, as a seed is formed in the capsule; and being there matured, by a nutriment derived from the stem, is gradually separated from it."

Here we are taught, not merely that there is something like an organic connection, and that the faith of the parent comes easily to be the faith of the child, but also that the character of the child is actually included in that of the parent, as a seed is formed in the capsule, or seed vessel, of a plant. "According to the most proper view of the subject," it is soon added, "a child is really not born till he emerges from the infantile state." He "is still within the matrix for formative womb] of the parental life, and will be, more or less, for many years. And the parental life will be flowing into him all that time, just as naturally, and by a law as truly organic, as when the sap of the trunk flows into a limb. . . . Whatever the requirement of parents may be, he can as little withstand it as the violet can cool the scorching sun, or the tattered leaf can tame the hurricane. . . . Their will and character are designed to be the matrix [or mould] of the child's will and character." On the 30th page it is stated that "The parent exercises himself in the child, playing his emotions and sentiments, and working a character in him by virtue of an organic power."

These representations remind us of what we heard, forty years ago, at New Lanark, in Scotland. The distinguished free thinking philanthropist, Robert Owen, had invited several strangers, who were from America and from various parts of Europe, to breakfast with him and his family. At the table he took occasion to advocate some of his favorite theories. We are all, he said, creatures of circumstances. And, holding up his coffee cup, he added, We are no more responsible for our characters than this cup is for its shape.

Here was truth, but not the whole truth; and the true was so exaggerated, and so connected with error, as to mislead. Dr. Bushnell, certainly, would be as far as any man from adopting Mr. Owen's conclusion. But too often his statement is an exaggeration; and it tends to mystify what it was intended to illustrate. It can hardly fail to mislead

many an honest inquirer; and it may have confused, in some measure, the ideas of the ingenious and acute author himself. If he means to say that, through the arrangements of Divine Providence there subsists between the parent and the child such a connection as enables the parent to contribute much towards forming the religious character of the child, we have nothing to object. Such a connection is involved in the organization of the family; and it was kindly intended to be pre-eminently an instrument of benefit, inasmuch as parents are pre-eminently the natural guides and guardians of their children. But what in this matter is emphatically the case with parents is the case also with others, in proportion to their opportunities of exerting on the young a good influence in the formation of character. This Dr. Bushnell does not and cannot deny. He seems to admit it fully on the 31st page, where he says: "Certain it is that we are never, at any age, so independent as to be wholly out of the reach of organic laws which affect our character. All society is organic—the church, the state, the school, the family; and there is a spirit in each of these organisms, peculiar to itself, and more or less hostile, more or less favorable to religious character, and, to some extent at least, sovereign over the individual man. A very great share of the power in what is called a revival of religion, is organic power; nor is it any the less divine on that account. The child is only more within the power of organic laws than we all are. We possess only a mixed individuality all our life long. A pure, separate, individual man, living wholly within, and from himself, is a mere fiction. No such person ever existed, or ever can."

After a statement so explicit, it may seem captious to make any objection. But it is not to this statement that we object, except that what was intended to be expressed by the word organic would have been more readily perceived, if it had been expressed by some other word, or by a circumlocution.

Presented in plain language, the fact is very manifest that every person is influenced more or less by others, whether the influence be exerted designedly or undesignedly, and whether it be received consciously or unconsciously. The great human family are so constituted, or, in other words,

mankind are so organized, that it cannot be otherwise. And in the formation of character, the young especially, as we learn from observation, reason and Scripture, are likely to be, in the greatest measure, either benefited or injured by those with whom they are connected.

Here, it seems to us, is a solid and sufficient basis for Christian education, and for the most earnest and impressive appeals that can be made to parents. Dr. Bushnell, however, it is probable, has in his mind the exaggerated part of his representation when he says (page 31): "This view of an organic connection subsisting between parent and child, lays a basis for notions of Christian education far different from those which now prevail, under the cover of a merely fictitious and mischievous individualism." On the 29th page he says: "The tendency of all our modern speculations is to an extreme individualism, and we carry our doctrines of free will so far as to make little or nothing of organic laws; not observing that character may be, to a great extent, only the free development of exercises previously wrought in us, or extended to us, when other wills had us within their sphere. All the Baptist theories of religion are based on this error. They assume, as a first truth, that no such thing is possible as an organic connection of character." And (p. 39), "How can we ever attain to any right conception of organic duties, until we discover the reality of organic powers and relations? And how can we hope to set ourselves in harmony with the Scriptures in regard to family nurture, or household baptism, or any other kindred subject, while our theories exclude or overlook precisely that which is the base of their teachings and appointments? This brings me to my last argument, which is drawn from infant or household baptism;—a rite which supposes the fact of an organic connection of character between the parent and the child; a seal of faith in the parent, applied over to the child, on the ground of a presumption that his faith is wrapped up in the parent's faith; so that he is accounted a believer from the beginning. We must distinguish here between a fact and a presumption of fact. If you look upon a seed of wheat, it contains, in itself, presumptively, a thousand generations of wheat, though by reason of some fault in the cultivation, or some speck of diseased matter in itself, it may, in fact, never reproduce at all. So the Christian parent has, in his character, a germ, which has power, presumptively, to produce its like in his children, though by reason of some bad fault in itself, or possibly some outward hindrance in the Church, or some providence of death, it may fail to do so. Thus it is that infant baptism becomes an appropriate rite. It sees the child in the parent, counts him presumptively a believer and a Christian, and, with the parent, baptizes him also."

From this passage it is evident that Dr. Bushnell would have us understand, by an organic connection of character between the parent and the child, such a connection as authorizes us to presume that the child's faith is wrapped up in the parent's faith; so that the child is to be accounted a believer from his earliest infancy. An ingenious assumption indeed! but one that contradicts the common sense of all mankind. To account a child in his earliest infancy to be a believer is to account him to be what everybody knows that he is not; and to baptize him as a believer is to baptize him as being what everybody knows that he is not. This consideration alone is sufficient to show that the proceeding is unwarrantable, and that the assumption ought not to be made. We shall soon have occasion to show, also, that it cannot be reconciled with the teachings of our Lord and of his apostles, and with the practice of their earliest successors.

In regard to the statement that "All the Baptist theories of religion are based on the error" of "an extreme individualism," we think that the author is under an erroneous impression. There are two extremes, the one ascribing too much to the parent and too little to the child; and the other, too much to the child, and too little to the parent. We would avoid both of these extremes. We would have parents lay to heart their responsibilities; and we would have children remember that they, too, are responsible to God. We would have parents fulfil their duties according to their best light and ability; and we would have children fulfil theirs, in the loveliness of

filial obedience, with a due regard to the will of the Lord. And, as they come to evince a Christian spirit, and to have a competent knowledge of the simple truths of Christianity, so as to receive baptism and the Lord's Supper understandingly and with spiritual benefit, we would have them baptized. professing their faith in the Saviour, and their earnest purpose to live as becomes his sincere and devoted disciples. In their early childhood we would have them, according to their capacities, receive all good impressions and influences, from earth and from heaven. We would have them led by alluring example and timely instruction to Him who said, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not. We would have them brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; and we would look fervently and confidingly to Him for his blessing upon them. We would have them, like Timothy when he was a child, know and love "the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." And thus we would have them (to use the language of our author himself) "pass out, by degrees, through a course of mixed agency, to a proper independency and self-possession."

Dr. Bushnell represents his view of Christian nurture to be "radically one with the ancient doctrine of baptism and regeneration, advanced by Christ, and accepted by the first Fathers." He adds, "We have much to say of baptismal regeneration as a great error, which undoubtedly it is, in the form in which it is held; but it is only a less hurtful error than some of us hold in denying it. . . . The regeneration is not actual, but only presumptive, and everything depends upon the organic law of character pertaining between the parent and the child, the Church and the child, thus upon duty and holy living and gracious example. The child is too young to choose the rite for himself; but the parent, having him, as it were, in his own life, is allowed the confidence that his own faith and character will be reproduced in the child, and grow up in his growth, and that thus the propriety of the rite as a seal of faith will not be violated. In giving us this rite, on the grounds stated, God promises, in fact, on his part, to dispense that spiritual grace which is necessary to the fulfilment of its import." (pp. 46, 47.) "Now the true conception is, that baptism is applied to the child on the ground of its organic unity with the parents; imparting and pledging a grace to sanctify that unity, and make it good in the field of religion. By the supposition, however, the child still remains within the known laws of character in the house, to receive, under these, whatever good may reach him; not snatched away by an abrupt, fantastical, and therefore incredible grace. He is taken to be regenerate, not historically speaking, but presumptively, on the ground of his known connection with the parent character, and the divine or church life, which is the life of that character. Perhaps I shall be understood more easily, if I say, that the child is potentially regenerate. being regarded as existing in connection with powers and causes that contain the fact, before time and separate from time. For when the fact appears historically, under the law of time, it is not more truly real, in a certain sense, than it was before. And then the grace conferred, being conferred by no casual act, but resting in the established laws of character, in the church and the house, is not lost by unfaithfulness, but remains and lingers still, though abused and weakened, to encourage new struggles. Thus it will be seen that the doctrine of organic unity I have been asserting, proves its theologic value, as a ready solvent for the rather perplexing difficulties of this difficult subject. Only one difficulty remains, namely, that so few can believe the doctrine." (pp. 116, 117.)

This "one difficulty" is not easily removed. It arises from the utter unreasonableness of the demand made on our credulity. Respecting Dr. Bushnell's theory, a candid and intelligent writer, Professor Curtis, of the University at Lewisburg, Pa., has remarked as follows: "It assumes always a conjunction of three things, no one of which can be shown to occur at all. 1. That the parent shall perfectly discharge his duty; 2. That the Church shall also perfectly do the same; and 3, That if both of these do thus, God will in every case not only save that child at last, but effectually call it in earliest infancy;

so that it shall 'open on the world spiritually renewed.'... It takes for granted that in the case of every child baptized, the two former, or human conditions, will be perfectly fulfilled; and then it further presumes that the third or divine result will not only eventually but immediately follow. This we think the very extreme of presuming."*

How can any man wonder that so few can believe the doctrine? Besides, Dr. Bushnell's theory requires us to believe that the child is to be baptized as a believer on the ground of its organic unity with the parents; that baptism imparts and pledges a grace to sanctify that unity, and make it good in the field of religion; that God has given us the rite of infant baptism; and that He has promised to bestow the spiritual grace necessary to the fulfilment of its import.

DR. BUSHNELL'S ARGUMENTS FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

II.

JEWISH PROSELYTE BAPTISM, AND THE CONVERSATION WITH NICODEMUS.

The true idea of infant baptism, it is asserted on the 43rd page, "is seen most evidently in the history of its establishment by Christ, in the third chapter of John." The argument is set forth thus: "The Jewish nation regarded other nations Hence when a Gentile family wished to become Jewish citizens, they were baptized in token of cleansing. Then they were said to be re-born, or regenerated, so as to be accounted true descendants of Abraham. We use the term naturalize, that is, to make natural born, in the same sense. But Christ had come to set up a spiritual kingdom, the kingdom of heaven; and finding all men aliens, and spiritually unclean, he applies over the rite of baptism, which was familiar to the Jews ('art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?') giving it a higher sense: 'Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven.' But the Gentile proselyte, according to the custom here described—here is the point of the argument—

^{*} See the Progress of Baptist Principles in the Last Hundred Years, p. 257.

came with his family. They were all baptized together, young and old, all regenerated or naturalized together; and therefore, in the new application made of the rite to signify spiritual cleansing and regeneration, it is understood, of course, that children are to come with their parents. To have excluded them would have been, to every Jewish mind, the height of absurdity. They could not have been excluded, without express exception; and no exception was made. Some have questioned whether proselyte baptism existed at this early age; but of this the third chapter of John is itself conclusive proof; for how else was baptism familiarly known to the Jews as connected with regeneration,—that is, civil regeneration?"

We reply: No one has yet proved that our Saviour, when he spoke of being born again, expected Nicodemus to have in his mind proselyte baptism and civil regeneration. We are aware of the assumption made by Mr. Wall in his History of Infant Baptism, and of the array of authorities which he has presented. But those authorities are not competent and reliable witnesses respecting what was customary previous to the Christian era.

Our Saviour incidentally, on a certain occasion, intimated the pains that had to be taken to make a proselyte. "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte." In the depressed state of the Jewish nation, under the Romans, cases of proselytism, it is obvious, must have been much less frequent than at some former periods. Among those, however, which did occur within a few years of our Lord's entering on his public ministry, one was very remarkable. It was the case of Izates, king of Adiabene, a Syrian territory south of Damascus. The Jewish historian Josephus, a contemporary of the apostles, has given a particular account of this distinguished individual's becoming a proselyte and of his being circumcised; but he says not one word of his being baptized.* At a somewhat earlier period, the Idumeans had, in effect, been compelled to adopt the Jewish religion. Josephus mentions their being circumcised, but of their being baptized in connection with their becoming proselytes he says nothing.+

^{*}Antiquities of the Jews, B. XX.-C. ii. § 3 and 4. † Antiq. B. XIII. ix. § 1.

De Wette, in his Hebrew and Jewish Archæology, says: "According to the Rabbis, circumcision, an offering, and baptism were necessary to the reception of proselytes. Baptism, however, is probably a later institute, for it is not mentioned in the older writings, but only in the Gemara, whose testimony speaks merely for the time after the destruction of Jerusalem, and in other later writings. Yet, connected with proselyte consecration there may have been in ancient times a kind of lustration, from which proselyte baptism (perhaps not without an imitation of the Christian) has arisen*. Dr. Bengel, Professor and Superintendent of the Theological Seminary at Tübingen, says: "It was reckoned in the same class with all those other lustrations to which the Jews were accustomed. . . . was not regarded as a *principal* thing, nor as an essentially necessary part of proselyte consecration. . . . But the entirely changed condition to which they found themselves reduced by the overthrow of their state and of their temple" (A.D. 70) "led at length, as it seems, to new and finally more fixed decrees and regulations on this subject." (See his work on the age of the Jewish Proselyte Baptism, p. 115.)

According to one of the regulations, "a male is not baptized till he is well healed of the wound occasioned by the circumcision, which always precedes.† Hence it is evident that proselyte baptism was not immediately connected with circumcision. It intervened at a considerable distance between this and the presentation of an offering, and was more closely connected with the offering than with the circumcision,—which, strictly speaking, must always have been the initiatory rite, whenever it could be performed. After the destruction of the temple, the offering could not lawfully be presented; and after the destruction of the temple, also, there were times in which the Jews were by imperial authority forbidden to perform the circumcision. In these circumstances, the ablution would naturally assume a greater importance than at any former period.

*Lehrbuch der hebräisch-judischen archäologie, § 246, a.

[†]Masculus non baptizantur, nisi vulnus culo illo, quod e circumcisione, quae semper praecedit, ceperat, bene curato. See Danzii Baptism. Proselyt, in Meuschen Nov. Test. ex Talmude antiq. Heb. Illustratum, p. 283.

Whatever may have been the time when proselyte baptism, ablution, or lustration first came into use, it was never performed on a proselyte's child born after the time of the proselytism. How then could it be a model for infant baptism in regard to the children of Christians born after the conversion of their parents? Besides, the act was performed by the proselyte himself. John's baptism was administered by John to his disciples; and hence he was denominated the Baptist, that is, the Baptizer.

The ablution of proselytes among the Jews, whenever it was practised, must, so far as it was initiatory, have had reference mainly to ideas of national purity on the one hand, or to a want of it on the other. The rite performed by the harbinger of Christ was not a national but a personal concern. It was administered to such Jews themselves as were penitent; and it had reference to the penitent individual's being cleansed from the pollution of his sins, in connection with the coming of the Messiah. Its import as a symbol of purification, was readily comprehended in view of the addresses made to the people, and of its resemblance to the many ablutions to which they had been accustomed, especially whenever a person was cleansed from ceremonial defilements. This was always a personal transaction; and these ablutions were ten thousand times more frequent than any connected with the reception of proselytes.

Dr. Bengel, in his work already mentioned, observes (p. 63): "John must have considered the question, Why baptizest thou? as referring to his baptism,—to the essential and characteristic nature of it, already well known, on account of which the Jews believed that it would be committed only to the Messiah, or to one of his prophetic heralds. It was perfectly obvious that they who came with the question had reference to his baptism, which was so peculiar, that there should belong to it an altogether special divine authority. It would have been quite superfluous for them to have made particular mention of proselyte baptism, which would not have been at all thought of in connection with John's baptism."

The whole subject has been re-examined by another German author, Dr. Schneckenburger; and he gives, as the result of his investigations, the following general propositions:

- "1. The representation of the Talmud, by itself and in comparison with other accounts, cannot prove that proselyte baptism was established before the time of Christ.
- 2. The passages from earlier writings, brought for the support of the Talmudical accounts, cannot afford any probable evidence, and much less, any certainty.
- 3. The internal opposing evidence, furnished by the silence of the most considerable writers, or by particular facts which they have mentioned, retains its validity.
- 4. The difficulties in the way of admitting that this custom came to prevail among the Jews after it had arisen among the Christians are not very great. Indeed there are many reasons making it highly probable that, as an integral part of the initiatory ceremonies, it came up in this later time, as well as definite testimonies in favor of such an opinion.
- 5. We are not, therefore, to think of deriving John's and he Christian rite from this Jewish one; and usages present themselves more akin to that rite, both in form and signification, than the ablution of Jewish proselytes appears to have been."*

To us, indeed, the assumption seems exceedingly improbable that our Saviour, in his interview with Nicodemus, had in his own mind, as the type, illustration, and model of entrance into his holy kingdom, any process of proselytism, vaunted and desecrated by Pharisaical formalists. On one occasion he says: "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him two fold more the child of hell than yourselves." How much more reasonable it is to believe that

^{*}See the volume on the age of the Jewish Proselyte Baptism and its connection with John's and the Christian Rite. Ueber das alter der judischen Proselyten-Taufe und deren Zusammenhaug mit dem johanneischen und Christlichen Ritus.

[†]Mat. xxiii: 15,

in the case before us, he had in his mind the preaching and baptism of his harbinger, whose mission it was to make ready a people prepared for the Lord*. Nicodemus, with all his amiable courtesy, was a Pharisee. John had said to many of the Pharisees and Sadducees, "Bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father" (as much as to say, Expect not to be received as being the offspring even of Abraham); "for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."+ The burden of his preaching was, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. The people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.§ Nicodemus might well be reminded of the inexcusableness of that rejection. The Messiah himself, it is well known, approved and vindicated the teachings and claims of John. The harbinger's preaching accorded with his own. Matthew (iv: 17) says: "Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." And Mark (i: 14, 15) asserts the same, with some amplification: "After that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the Gospel."

To repent was to have such a change of disposition as to loathe and forsake sin. It was equivalent to having a new heart, a heart to obey God as his dutiful child, and thus it was, in effect, to be born again. It was to be taught of the Lord, and led by his spirit, so as to have a right spirit, an earnest desire to be cleansed from all sin, internal as well as external. In a word, it was to be prepared to enter, with humility and gratitude, the predicted kingdom of the holy Messiah.

Ought not Nicodemus, a teacher in Israel, to have known these things, and to have understood the expressions used by

^{*}Luke i: 17. †Matt. iii: 8, 9. ‡Matt. iii: 2. §Luke vii: 29, 30.

our Lord? Had he never read in the ancient Hebrew Scriptures, the prayer of a penitent, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me.* Had he never read in the Prophets, Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes.+ Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel ? A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you. . . I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes. There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. . . He shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears. But with righteousness shall be judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap.**

Had Nicodemus duly considered such passages as these, he could not have failed to perceive, when our Lord spoke of being born again, that he had reference to that change of mind, that purification of the soul, which is involved in genuine repentance. It was manifestly a suitable preparation for entering the kingdom of that Holy One who could not be deceived, and who was to be to all "like a refiner's fire." Some of the Jews,

^{*}Ps. li:10, 11. †Is. i:16. ‡Ezek. xviii:30, 31. §Ezek. xxxvi:26, 27. ||Is. xi:1,3,4. ¶Is. liii:6. **Mal. iii:1,2.

it is certain, had substantially correct views on this subject. The preaching of John, and the baptism which he had been divinely authorized to administer, had made a deep impression, and awakened the minds of many. The statement given by Josephus, as well as the more ample record in the New Testament, is worthy of being remembered. He says: "Herod slew John that was called the Baptist, who was a good man; and who commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism; for that the washing with water would be acceptable to Him, if they made use of it not in order to the putting away of some sins only, but for the purification of the body; supposing still that the soul was purified before by righteousness."* Such a purifying of the soul, it is here evident, was understood to be distinct from the washing with water; for it was to precede that washing. The internal change was pre-supposed, as leading to the external acknowledgment, and as being requisite in order to make this a baptism acceptable to God.

There is a Rabbinic passage quoted by Schoettgen in his Hebrew and Talmudical Hours, according to which He who repents of his sins is like a child born to-day.† And on a memorable public occasion, our Lord declared, Verily I say unto you, Whosoever receiveth not the kingdom of God as a little child, shall not enter therein‡. He knew what was needed, a state of mind childlike and humble before God. Who does not remember those impressive words of his: "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight?" And who does not perceive that, when he was conversing with Nicodemus, he was expostulating with a person in danger of being blinded by Pharisaical prepossessions, and was teaching him what he most needed to learn?

In every age, the grateful penitent has readily ascribed his change to God, the Holy Spirit. And as many as are led by

^{*}Antiq. B. XVIII. c. v, §2. †Vol. 1. p. 328, from Ir. Gibborim, fol. 19, 3. ‡Mark x: 15

Vol. xviii.—34.

the spirit of God, they are the children of God. They are born again, born of God, regenerated. These and similar expressions, all must admit, were used, in the earliest days of Christianity, for indicating the internal and moral change, the spiritual regeneration, which it demanded. They occur frequently in the New Testament, and sometimes in the early ecclesiastical fathers, as Justin Martyr, and Clement of Alexandria, though, at a very early period, baptism was often confounded with spiritual regeneration; the sign, with the thing signified.

But in the case before us there is no room for such a confounding. Our Lord gives unmistakable prominence to the spiritual renewing. On this He expatiates, as the great absorbing subject; and He finishes his illustration by saying, So is every one that is born of the Spirit. Then, in words of mingled tenderness and dignity, He proceeds to press on the Pharisee's conscience the neglect of ample evidence, and to set forth the great object of his own coming into the world, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life; the love of God in sending Him; and the condemnation of men for loving darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. Common sense and common candor must understand him as speaking to Nicodemus, not of unconscious babes, but of responsible moral agents. So when He said to his apostles, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned; He had reference, most manifestly, not to unconscious babes, but to persons to whom the gospel could be preached. We need not doubt that what we cannot do, He, the wise and compassionate Saviour, will provide for the little ones, in a way adapted to their state.

According to the great commission, he that trusts in the Saviour and obeys him (for baptism is the appointed manifestation of a purpose to obey him in all things) shall be saved. But he that refuses to trust in Him shall be condemned. The unbeliever is to be condemned for his unbelief, his sinful neglect of the gospel. In his case, baptism is not mentioned at all. It

is precluded by his unbelief. So, in the latter part of the conversation with Nicodemus, it is declared that the believer has eternal life; but that the unbeliever is condemned for his unbelief, because he loves darkness, and perversely refuses to come to the light. In his case, also, baptism is not mentioned at all, it being precluded by his impenitent and sinful unbelief.

Surely, we can discover here no traces of Jewish proselytism, and no evidence of our Lord's establishing Infant Baptism. On the contrary, we have seen that he taught in harmony with John, whose teaching and baptism had awakened much attention, and were exceedingly prominent in the view of the Jews. John's was the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; and he, according to the best light then bestowed, directed to the coming Messiah those whom he baptized, saying unto the people that they should believe on Him who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.* The baptism which he administered presupposed repentance, a purification of soul, in the baptized. It had reference to one's own spiritual state and his purpose. It was thus a personal transaction. In this respect, it resembled the numerous purifications for ceremonial defilement among the Jews, and was easily understood, when administered to the penitent desiring to be purified from the defilement of sin.

Of the same character, unquestionably, was the baptism administered by the disciples of Christ, under his own eye, before his crucifixion. They were carrying forward the work begun by him who had baptized them, and whose ministry was "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ." And when at last they were commanded to go into all the world, and preach, and baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, they would, not only from the terms of the commission, but also from the practice to which they had been accustomed, understand that they were to baptize, not unconscious infants but penitent believers. The practice to which they had been accustomed is clear and undeniable. That of proselyte-baptism, it is probable, had not yet

^{*}Acts xix: 4.

been established as a part of the ceremony initiating into Judaism. If it existed at all, it was of comparatively rare occurrence, and more closely connected with the presentation of an offering than with the circumcision, which alone as the initiatory rite, was prescribed by the Mosaic law. The practice to which the apostles had been accustomed, it is well known, had the sanction of our Lord, but this cannot be said of any Jewish proselyte-baptism, or of its being transferred to the Christian dispensation, whether we regard the principle which it would involve, or the spirit which it would cherish.

The baptism introduced by John, for penitent Jews, and practised also by the disciples of Christ before his crucifixion, and not any Pharisaical ablution of a proselyte, would be the baptism of which these disciples would think, when they received the final commission, modified only by the more full declaration which our ascending Lord saw fit then to make. This was the baptism which they had reason to believe was "from heaven;" and it was associated with announcements and events proclaiming the Messiah and the establishment of the new dispensation.

The important fact to which we here call attention, ought not to be overlooked; and it cannot be frittered away by the groundless assertion that John baptized infants. Of this we have never seen a particle of evidence. That he did any such thing is contradicted by every intimation in the sacred record respecting his practice, and by the testimony of the Jewish historian, who speaks of him as representing his baptism to be acceptable to God, when received by the thoroughly penitent, supposing still that the soul was purified before by right-eousness.

middle to which they had been accommed is cloud such mide-

DEVELOPED.

DR. BUSHNELL'S ARGUMENTS FOR INFANT BAPTISM. III.

PETER PROCLAIMED AN INSTITUTE WHICH HE HIMSELF DID NOT THEN EVEN THINK OF, BUT WHICH, AT A LATER PERIOD, WAS PROPERLY

Some who have been constrained to admit that in the New Testament there is no evidence for infant baptism, and yet have desired to retain the practice, suppose it to have been developed, sometime after the days of the Apostles, from a truly Christian principle. According to their view, the good seed was planted; but at least one or two ages were required for its germinating into light, and yielding blossoms and fruit. Or, it was wisely kept out of sight; for, had it appeared earlier, it would have been assailed by the Apostle Paul, as being inconsistent with his great and favorite doctrine of justification by faith. Dr. Bushnell has his own way of viewing the matter. Without relinquishing arguments from the New Testament, he provides a scheme of development for saving infant baptism. From the words in Acts ii: 39 (The promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call), he gives a discourse entitled, Infant Baptism; how developed.

The apostle Peter, in the preceding part of his address, it will be recollected, had mentioned the promise in the prophet Joel respecting the gift of the spirit, through whose efficacy the people, old and young, were to be moved and enabled to see visions and to prophesy.* And he had just said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." He adds immediately, "For the promise [respecting that gift] is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." In other words, The blessings promised are for all that obey the Gospel, whether old or young, at Jerusalem or elsewhere.

^{*}Joel 2: 28, 39.

Such is the obvious meaning of the apostle. If any one doubts it, let him read the words quoted from the prophet, in the part of the address (Acts ii: 17) to which we have referred.

But according to Dr. Bushnell's explanation of the text, it is "a declaration that can signify nothing but the engagement of Christ, in his new and more spiritual economy, to identify children with their parents, even as they had been identified in the coarser provisions of the old. 'To you and to your children,'says the apostle; and here, covertly as it were to himself, are hid infant baptism, infant church relations, potentially present but as yet undeveloped, even in what may be fitly called the seed sermon of the Christian Church. This was no time to be thinking of infants, or children, as related to church polity; probably there is not one present in the great assembly. It will be soon enough to settle the church position of children, when the question rises practically afterwards. These converted pilgrims, Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and strangers of all names, may not even so much as think of the question till they reach their homes again. But the language we can see is Jewish; language of promise, or covenant, only with a Christian addition—'and to them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call'-and Peter, as we know, did not really come into the meaning of this language himself till years after, when the great sheet let down from heaven three times, and the actual ministering to a Gentile convert, showed him whither, and how far, the call of the Lord might be going, in these times, to run. Let it not surprise us, then, that the facts of infant baptism, and of infant church relations, covered as they are by Peter's language in this first sermon, are still not yet developed, even to himself-any more than the fact of Christ's call to the Gentiles."

Christ had clearly commanded the apostles to go into all the world and preach to all; and the prophets had foretold the conversion of the Gentiles. Peter and the other apostles needed to have the command brought vividly to their remembrance, with some additional instructions in regard to the time and manner of carrying it into execution; but they must have known the fact that the gospel was designed for all.

Dr. Bushnell proceeds: "And when our Baptist brethren reiterate the formula, 'believe and be baptised,' 'believe and be baptized,' which they assume to be absolutely conclusive and final on the question of infant baptism, because infants can not believe, they have only to make due allowance for the fact that Christianity must needs make its chief address at the outset to adult persons, and their argument vanishes. tianity will of course address itself to the subjects adressed; and, telling them what they must do to be saved, it will not of course tell them, at the same breath, everything else that is fit to be known. In this manner its language was naturally shaped, for a considerable time, so as to meet only the conditions of adult minds. When at length it shall begin to be inquired, what is the condition of immature, or infant minds? it will be soon enough to say something appropriate to them."

The language of Christianity, for a considerable time, it is here said, was shaped "so as to meet only the conditions of adult minds." If this means that the gospel addressed itself to those who were sufficiently mature to receive it, and taught them, first of all, what they must do to be saved, we make no objection. But we cannot forget that Paul and Silas, when they told the jailor what he must do to be saved, gave him instruction, without delay, respecting also his household, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house, and they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house."* When we recollect our Saviour's manifestation of his lively interest in children, and his commanding his apostles to baptize believers, 'teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; when we think of the manner in which the apostle mentions Timothy's knowing the Holy Scriptures from early childhood, and of the command to parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, how can we believe that any considerable length of time elapsed before the first Christians were taught the elementary doctrine of Christian baptism, in harmony with a tender affection for their children, and a becoming interest in their spiritual welfare?

^{*}Acts xvi: 31, 32.

In regard to the requiring of faith. Dr. Bushnell asks, "Does it therefore follow, because it is so continually given to adults as the fixed law of salvation—he that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned—that infants dying in infancy, and too young to believe, must therefore be inev-No, it will be answered, even by our itably damned? Baptist brethren themselves; for the language referred to was evidently designed only for adult persons, and is of course to be qualified so as to meet the demands of reason, when we come to the case of children. And why not also the language 'believe and be baptized?' Say not that the child is not old enough to believe, and therefore cannot be baptized. If he is not old enough to believe, how can he better be saved? Is it a greater and higher, and more difficult thing to be admitted to baptism, than to be admitted to eternal glory?"

We reply: The words in the final commission (He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned) were, of course, never designed for any too young to believe, and as baptism is mentioned by our Lord and his apostles as a consequence of believing, there is no mention at all of one's being baptized who does not believe. Whoever does not become a believer, there is no occasion for his being baptized; and in such a case nothing in the commission is said of baptism. This is mentioned there only in connection with believing. It is omitted in the clause that speaks of not believing. They who, through their love of sin neglect the gospel, are condemned. Others too young to have faith or to make, understandingly and with spiritual benefit, a profession of their devotedness to the Saviour, we would lead to Him in ways adapted to the 'condition of immature and infant minds,' that they may early know, and love, and obey Him. In our view, to baptize them before they appear to be believers would be to disregard our Lord's arrangement, and deprive them of its benefit. Our unauthorized act, performed upon them in their unconscious infancy, would tend to prevent their doing what, at the proper time, they should do, as conscious and confiding disciples. If, in the mean time, they be removed from our embrace and from our parental care, we would commit them, with cheerful confidence, to Him who took up little children in his arms, laid his hands upon them, and blessed them, without their being baptized, and without deeming it either requisite or suitable to extend to them the ordinance of baptism. In that spiritual world of which we all know so little, He can elevate, expand, and, in every respect, prepare the once infant mind for the enjoyment of the heavenly state. At present we see through a glass darkly, and do not know how the salvation is accomplished; but we trust in the wisdom, power, and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. "With God all things are possible." It is not for us to ask, which is "greater, and higher, and more difficult," baptism or salvation? and conclude that we are to baptize all that God can save. The proper question is, What did our Lord establish as the rule for his followers here on earth? This it is for us to ascertain and observe.

After expatiating on the Pentecostal scenes at Jerusalem, in connection with the Apostle Peter's sermon, and showing that much appearing there was transient, and that much pertaining to Christianity was introduced afterwards, Dr. Bushnell at length comes to his object. "But the particular point," he says, "for which I have drawn this sketch has been purposely left behind. Infant baptism, the relation of the seminal and undeveloped first period of human existence to Christ and his flock, that which appears only implicitly in the sermon of Peter, on the day of Pentecost—where is this, and what is to come, in the way of development, here? There was no reason, or even room, among the scenes of Pentecost, for so much as thinking on this subject of infants and their church relations. and scarcely more for a considerable time afterward. It could not become a subject of attention, until the church itself began to settle into forms of order and structural organization; and how soon that came to pass we do not definitely know. It should therefore be no subject of wonder that infant baptism figures somewhat indistinctly, for so long a time at least; and scarcely more, that it shows itself only by implication and a kind of tacit development, for a brief time afterwards.

"Furthermore, if it came to pass by a transference of Jewish

ideas into Christian spheres, Jewish modes and conditions into the Christian order and economy—just as Peter's Jewish language, when he said, in his pentecostal speech, 'to you and to your children,' finally came back to him in its Christian power, -it would make no bold and staring figure any where. If the Christian teachers looked to see all the better mercies of the old economy transferred into the Christian, and exalted there into some higher and more perfect meaning, we ought certainly not to expect any debate, or anything but a silent, scarcely conscious flow of transition, when infants are taken to be with their parents, in the church, the covenant, the Christian Israel of their faith. And in just this way the defect of any bold declarations on the subject of infant baptism in the writings of the New Testament, and the fact that it appears only in a few historic glimpses, and occasional modes of speech that are subtle implications of the fact, is sufficiently accounted for."

Dr. Bushnell intimates that infant baptism came to pass, just as Peter's Jewish language, when he said, in his Pentecostal speech 'to you and to your children,' finally came back to him in its Christian power." But what is here assumed as an illustrating fact, our readers will perceive, is only an imagination.

Had infant baptism been transferred into the Christian dispensation by a transference of Jewish ideas into Christian spheres, Jewish modes and conditions into the christian order and economy,—that is, had it, as Dr. Bushnell elsewhere represents, been intuitively transferred, it could not have failed of being mentioned somewhere in the New Testament, which so frequently, and in so great a variety of connections, introduces the subject of baptism. For one moment, let us think of the consultation at Jerusalem respecting circumcision, as it is recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts. infant baptism came into use, either in the place of infant circumcision, or on the same principle, either among the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, or among the Gentile Christians at Antioch, the fact could not have been passed over in silence. Let us think, too, of the account respecting Philip's preaching to the people in the city of Samaria. When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.* If children were baptized on account of the faith of their parents, why does not the record add the words, and their children? But we will not detain our readers with instances of silence, where silence cannot be well accounted for, if there was such a practice as that of which we are speaking.

In the close of the last extract, Dr. Bushnell acknowledges that, in the New Testament, infant baptism "appears only in a few historic glimpses, and occasional modes of speech that are subtle implications of the fact." Whether it appears there at all or not, we shall by and by endeavor to ascertain, and to put our readers in the way of ascertaining.

"But," continues Dr. Bushnell, "we are inquiring after the mode in which this rite became an accepted element of the Christian organization, and a part of the church practice, as we certainly know that it did at sometime afterward. Peter probably conceived as little what his language might infer respecting it, as he certainly did what hidden import there was in his testimony, by the same words, of grace to the Gentiles; for he spoke in prophetic exaltation, as the ancient prophets did, not knowing what the spirit of Christ did signify. But suppose one of these adult converts at the Pentecost to have set off, after the few happy weeks of his sojourn are ended, for his home in some remote region of Arabia, Parthia, He carries Christ with him, he is a new man, filled with a strange joy, burning with a strange, all-sacrificing love to the cause of his new Master, and to every sinner of mankind. He begins to preach the Christ he loves to his friends, tells them all he knows of the new gospel, speaks to them as one whom Christ has endowed with power to speak. He gathers a little circle, which we may call a church, around him, perhaps converts a little obscure synagogue into a church. He knows that he himself was baptized as a token of his faith, and he has heard a thousand times repeated, Christ's words, 'he that believeth and is baptized,' 'except a man be born of water and of the spirit,' and he does not scruple to baptize all his new fellow disciples. Then comes the question, what of the families? what of the infants we have, who are not old enough to believe? This, on the supposition that he had heard nothing of infant baptism before he left Jerusalem, which may or may not be true. But he has heard the whole story of Christ's life many times over, including the fact of his beautiful interest in children, and his declaration, 'Of such is the kingdom.' He recollects also the ancient religion of his people; how it identified always the children with the fathers, and included them in the covenant of the fathers, raising doubtless the question, whether the gospel in its nobler, wider generosity and completer grace, would fall short even of the old religion in its tenderness to the family affections, and its provisions for the religious unity of families. And just here, we will suppose, the words of Peter, in that first sermon, flash on his recollection—'for the promise is to you and to your children.' They meant almost nothing, it may be, when they were spoken, but how full and clear the meaning they now take! It is like a revelation. The doubt struggling in his bosom is over, the question is settled. 'My children,' he says, ' are with me, one with me in my faith, included with me in all my titles and hopes, and as I came in, out of the defilements of sin, and was baptized in token of my cleansing, so too are they to share my baptism and be heirs together with me in the grace of life.'

"Thus instructed, he will baptize his children, and make his religion a strictly family grace, expecting them to grow up in it; others also consenting with him in the same conclusion, and offering their children to God in the same manner. And, as the result, they will no more be Christians with families, but Christian families—all together in the church of God. In this manner, the Pentecost itself, when the seeds that are in it are developed, will almost certainly issue the adult baptism there begun, the baptism of the three thousand, in the common baptism of the house."

As a work of imagination, the picture here presented is

admirable. Why should we undertake to refute it? A voice of heavenly wisdom has proclaimed, "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream, and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord."*

DR. BUSHNELL'S ARGUMENTS FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

TV

THE RECEPTION OF YOUNG CHILDREN BY OUR LORD, AND APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY.

Dr. Bushnell states (p. 152) that "Christ comes very near to a specific and formal command of infant baptism, when we put together, side by side, what He says of baptism in the third chapter of John, and what He says concerning infants elsewhere." . . . What He said to Nicodemus, in the third chapter of John, we have already considered. Let us now see what He did and what He said concerning infants and young children, when they were brought to Him, as related by the Evangelists. + "Suffer the little children," He said, "to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God. . . . And He took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them." manifested the tenderest affection and regard for them, in ways adapted to their state; and thus He encouraged all to expect from Him the spiritual blessing that may be needed for our children, as well as for ourselves. But he neither baptized the little ones, nor commanded them to be baptized. Had infant baptism been in accordance with his will, surely He would have given some intimation of it, on an occasion so favorable.

One of the discourses in the volume before us is entitled "Apostolic Authority of Infant Baptism;" and it is based on I Cor. i: 16, I baptized also the house of Stephanas. In

^{*} Jer. xxiii: 28. †See Mat. xix: 13 15; Mark x: 13-16; Luke xviii: 15-17.

this Dr. Bushnell presents afresh the organic unity of the family as a ground for the baptism of infants. father and mother are not merely a man and a woman, but they are a man and a woman having children; and accordingly it is the father and mother, that is, the man and woman and their children, that are to be baptized." He adds: "It is precisely this great fact of an organic unity that is taken hold of and consecrated, in the field of religion, by the Abrahamic and other family covenants. And the whole course of revelation, both in the Old and New Testament, is tinged by associations, and sprinkled over with expressions that recognize the religious unity of families, and the inclusion of the children with the parents. All the promises run—'to you and to your children; for Peter's language here is only an inspired transfer and re-assertion of the Jewish family ideas, at the earliest moment, in the field of Christianity itself. . . . In this universal religion, therefore, we are to look for the continuance onward of the old family character and the inclusive oneness of fathers with their children. The only difference will be that the oneness will be raised into a more spiritual and higher sense, just as everything else was raised. The children are thus looked upon to be presumptively as believing in the faith, and regenerated in the regeneration of the fathers."

Rather, we would say, the children are looked upon to be what they are, children of believers, to be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;—and when they give evidence of being believers, they are looked upon to be such. Believing, like repenting, is a personal act. It cannot be performed by proxy. And the Scriptures nowhere authorize us to assume that children have faith merely because their parents have, or to account them as "regenerated in the regeneration of the fathers." On the contrary, a great principle is announced in the admonition, "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father."*

Dr. Bushnell proceeds: "And here again circumcision

comes to our aid, as another and distinct evidence. For it was given to be 'a seal of the righteousness of faith,' and the application of it, as a seal, to infant children, involves all the precise difficulties—neither more nor less—that are raised by the deniers of infant baptism. Let the point here made be accurately understood. The argument is not that infant baptism was directly substituted for circumcision. Of this there is no probable evidence. Such a substitution could not have been made without remark, discussion, opposition of prejudice, and the raising of contentions that would have required distinct mention, many times over, in the apostolic history. But the argument is this: that the Jewish mind was so familiarized by custom with the notion of an inclusive religious unity in families, (partly by the rite of circumcision,) that Christian baptism, being the seal of faith, was naturally and by a kind of associational instinct, applied over to families in the same manner. Not to have made such an application would have required some authoritative interposition, some dike of positive hindrance, to turn aside the current of Jewish prepossessions. And if there had risen up, somewhere, a man of Baptist notions, to ask, Where is the propriety of applying baptism, given as a rite for believers, to infants, who we certainly know are not old enough to believe? he could not even have begun to make an impression by it. Was not circumcision given to Abraham to be the seal of faith? And has it not been applied from his time down to the present, in this way-applied to infant children eight days old? True it is the doctrine of Christ, 'he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,' and our apostles too are saying, 'If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest.' So we all say and think, as relating to adult persons; but do we not all know that what is given to the father includes the children, and that his faith is the faith of the house? Nothing, in short, is plainer than that every argument raised to convict infant baptism of absurdity, holds, in the same manner, as convicting circumcision of absurdity, and all the religious polity of the former ages. Every such argument, too, mocks the religious feeling and conviction of all these former ages, in a way of disrespect equally presumptuous."

We reply: Abraham, as it is stated in Rom. iv: 11, "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe." From him a nation was to descend who should possess the land of Canaan, and be highly favored of God. As a memorial of Abraham's acceptable faith and of the promise given, he and all his male servants, and his and their male children eight days old, were to be circumcised. This was a positive institution, having its own national object and its peculiar purport. Baptism is a positive institution, having another object and a different purport. The circumcision of infants, as well as of adults, was enjoined. The baptism of infants has not been enjoined by any competent authority. It is inconsistent with the design of baptism as represented in the Holy Scriptures. And, so far as it is practised, it displaces and annuls what our Lord, in his wisdom, has enjoined. These are difficulties pertaining to infant baptism, which do not pertain to infant circumcision.

The argument, our author remarks. "is not that baptism was directly substituted for circumcision. . . . But the argument is this: that the Jewish mind was so familiarized by custom with the notion of an inclusive religious unity in families, (partly by the rite of circumcision,) that Christian baptism, being the seal of faith, was naturally and by a kind of associational instinct, applied over to families in the same manner." In other words: that infant baptism came, not in the place of infant circumcision, but on the same principle of an inclusive religious unity in families; and hence that it was intuitively applied. When he speaks of Christian baptism as "being the seal of faith," he must mean the parent's faith. Baptism is never, in the Bible, called a seal. It is so called in the Shepherd or Pastor of Hermas, a religious and imaginative work of the second century, that was widely circulated, and had great influence. And the phrase seal of faith, used subsequently by ecclesiastical writers, came to be confounded with the phrase, seal of the righteousness of faith, used by the apostle when he speaks of the sign of circumcision given to Abraham, as a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised. The first phrase had reference at first to the faith of him who received baptism, not to the faith of his parent; the second, to the justifying or acceptable character of Abraham's faith. Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye, therefore, that they who are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham."* It is they who themselves believe; not they who are merely the natural offspring of a believer.

It is asked (p. 148), "Do we not all know that what is given to the father includes the children?" that is, what is given to the father is given to his children; "and that his faith is the faith of the house?" We cannot answer in the affirmative, without limitation. The pastorate of a church, or membership in a scientific society, or in some association of artists, or of mechanics, or of merchants, may be given to a father, while it is not given to his children. If his faith is to be accounted the faith of the house, so that they are to be baptized in virtue of it, why did not the apostle Paul think of this great principle, when he wrote to the Corinthians, "If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away." + Why did he not add, But let her without delay be baptized? for, though unbelieving, she is sanctified by her husband; she is kindly disposed towards him; and "do we not all know that his faith is the faith of the house?"

We are not conscious of deserving the charge of presumptuousness. We have already shown that for observing infant circumcision the Jews had reasons which we have not for observing infant baptism. We would let every religious institute rest on its own basis. We ask only for evidence of its having been established by competent authority. The apostles themselves were sometimes thought to act presumptuously in

^{*} Gal. iii: 6, 7.

t I, Cor, vii: 12.

their efforts "to turn aside the current of Jewish prepossessions." No better apology is needed now, than that which they gave: "We ought to obey God rather than men."*

From the words of the apostle Paul in I. Cor. vii: 14, "Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy," Dr. Bushnell draws another argument for infant baptism. But the best Biblical scholars of the present age have clearly shown that the reasoning of the apostle, in this very passage, proves the non-existence of infant baptism in his time.

Some Jewish converts, it seems, questioned the propriety of a believer's continuing to live with an unbelieving wife or husband, supposing that such intimate intercourse would be defiling. The apostle Peter once had occasion to say: "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company or come unto one that is of another nation," or not a member of the same religious community; "but God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean." With the same enlarged Christian view the apostle Paul decides the case presented in the passage before us: Let not the believing consort thrust away the yet unbelieving. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified, so that he is not to be regarded as unclean by the wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified, so that she is not to be regarded as unclean by the husband. . . . He proceeds still farther to illustrate the propriety of the course that he enjoins. Addressing the Corinthian Church, he says, Else, that is, if the representation which I have given be not correct, if the yet unbelieving, and, of course unbaptized, wife or husband must be regarded as unclean, and therefore must be abandoned, then, by a parity of reasoning, your own children are unclean, and must be abandoned. The little ones, because they are not yet believers, must not even touch their own Christian parents! Your very infants must not be pressed to the bosoms of their own Christian mothers! But now such absurdity is obvious; but now it is manifest that, instead of being unclean, they are holy, or clean: they are objects suitable to be ministered to and cherished in all the endearing intercourse of domestic life, according to the arrangements of God for the temporal and spiritual welfare of families.

The kindred expression, is sanctified, used in connection with the unbelieving consort, attributes as much holiness, and holiness of the same kind, to that consort, as are attributed to the children of the Corinthian Christians. The holiness, in both cases, is freedom from such a state as would render family intercourse improper. As it did not imply the baptism of the consort not yet having faith in Christ, so it did not imply the baptism of the children not yet having faith in Christ. On the contrary, the reasoning of the apostle, all must perceive, proceeds on the assumption that the children referred to were not yet numbered among the believers, as all persons were who had been baptized.

So much for I. Cor. vii: 14. We ask our readers to ponder the passage carefully, and see for themselves what it shows. Rightly understood, we are confident, it will be found by them, as it has been by others, not only to give no evidence that infants were baptized, but, on the contrary, to testify positively that they were not baptized in the time of the apostles.

And this testimony is confirmed by Gal. iii: 26, 27. There the apostle Paul says to the Galatians: "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Observe how he connects the being children of God by faith with being baptized into Christ. The believers mentioned in the 26th verse are the same persons that are mentioned in the 27th. And these are as many as have been baptized. These, as believers, have put on Christ. Manifestly, then, the children too young to do this had not been baptized.

In connection with the misinterpretation of I. Cor. vii: 14, we have, on the 155th page, an instructive exhibition of the tendency of one error to produce another. It is there said, "So strong, even, is the conviction, in these apostolic times, of an organic unity sovereign over the faith and the religious affinities of children, that, where but one parent only believes, that faith carries presumptively the faith of the children with

it. And upon this grand fact of the religious economy, baptism was from the first, and properly, applied to the children of them that believe. Hence, too, it was that the children of believers were familiarly addressed by them as believers; as in the epistles of Paul to the Ephesians and Colossians. These epistles are formally inscribed to churches or Christian brotherhoods: 'To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus'; 'To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse.' And yet in both the children are particularly addressed: 'Children obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right;' 'Children obey your parents in all things; for this is well pleasing unto the Lord.' In this manner children are formally included among the 'faithful in Christ Jesus.'"

We rejoice that there were believing children in those churches, and that they with others who might listen to Christian instruction were encouraged to obey their parents, and thus set a worthy example for all children. We rejoice to see children now loving and honoring the Saviour as his disciples. Let them come early, and learn of Him who is meek and lowly in heart; and let them have the comfort and the benefit of expressing, in the way that He has appointed for his disciples, their childlike trust and devotedness, and of remembering the cordial consecration all their days. No one needs to be informed that the children addressed by the apostle were not mere infants.

The charge of inconsistency, which Dr. Bushnell urges against those who reject infant baptism, is remarkable: "The objectors themselves are admitting and practising, without difficulty, observances that have comparatively no specific authority at all. At the sacrament of the Supper they use leavened bread without scruple, when they know that it was not used by Christ himself, and was solemnly forbidden at the festival he was there, in fact, re-appointing for the Christian uses of his disciples in all future ages. Where, then, is the authority given for a change even in the element of the Holy Supper itself? The Christian Lord's Day, too, accepted in the place of the Jewish Sabbath, and that even against a specific

command of the Decalogue—how readily, and with how little scruple, do they accept this Lord's Day and let the ancient Sabbath go, when it is only by the faintest, most equivocal, or evanescent indications they can make out a shadow of authority for the change? 'Direct proof! positive command! specific injunction!' they say; 'without these, infant baptism has no right.' Where, then, do they get their authority for these other observances; one of them never referred to in Scripture at all, and the others so doubtfully that infant baptism has, in comparison, the clear evidence of day?'

What is not referred to in Scripture at all, we may safely conclude, can make no part of the institution of the Lord's Supper; and we shall be ready to practise infant baptism, when we find as much evidence for it as we have for the observance of the Lord's Day.

Still another argument is brought forward by Dr. Bushnell, with much confidence. We present it in his own words (p. 153): "What is said in the New Testament of household baptism, or the baptizing of households, is positive proof that infants were baptized in the times of the apostles—baptized, that is, in and because of the supposed faith of the parents. The fact of such baptism is three times distinctly mentioned: in the case of 'the household of Stephanas,' of Lydia 'and her houshold,' and the jailor 'and all his.' In the first case, nothing is said of faith at all, though doubtless he was baptized as a believer. In the second, everything turns on the personal faith of Lydia—'if ye have judged me to be faithful.' In the third, it seems to be said, according to an English translation, that all the house believed—' he rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house.' But the participle believing, is singular and not plural in the original, and the phrase—'with all his house'-plainly belongs to the verb and not to the par-Rigidly translated, the passage would read—'he rejoiced with all his house, himself believing."

The argument is easily answered. In the first case, that of Stephanas, in I. Cor. i: 16 (I baptized also the household of Stephanas), we need only compare this with what is said near the close of the epistle (xvi: 15): Ye know the house of

Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints. Here the household is described as converts, who exerted themselves to supply the wants of their poor and afflicted fellow disciples.

In the second case, that of Lydia, in Acts xvi: 15 ("When she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there")—we have only to read on to the end of the chapter, where it is stated, respecting Paul and Silas, when about to leave the city, after being released from prison, that they "entered into the house of Lydia; and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them and departed." With Lydia, doubtless, were her household. She, a seller of purple, it seems, had a mercantile establishment at Philippi. Of course, she would need persons to assist her; and who can doubt that her household who had been baptized were, in part at least, the brethren who were seen and comforted?

In the third case, that of the jailor, in Acts xvi: 33 (He was baptized, he and all his, straightway)—we have only to read the preceding verse, They spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. "All his," who, as stated in the thirty-third verse, were baptized, are manifestly the same as "all that were in his house," to whom, as stated in the thirty-second, the word of the Lord was spoken. Besides, in the thirty-fourth verse, we are informed that he rejoiced, with all his house, having believed in God. He, with all his, or all that were in his house, having believed the word of the Lord spoken to them, rejoiced. They all rejoiced, having believed. What is said of the jailor, is here said also of his household. This is clearly indicated by the phrase with all his house. If the word of the Lord was spoken to all that were in his house, and if he rejoiced with all his house, that is, he and they rejoiced together (and this is the obvious and undeniable meaning), surely we must admit that not only he but they also could and did believe. The rejoicing was a consequence of believing; and how could they participate in the joy of believing, if they had not believed? The effort to make it supposed that they did not believe, by inserting the word himself before the word believing—"himself believing"—is a very grave error. We are sorry to see it; especially in so excellent a man as Dr. Bushnell. The correctness of our interpretation is further confirmed by the case of Crispus, mentioned in Acts xviii: 8 And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized.

In view of what has been stated respecting these and other passages, we hope that our readers will feel the duty of searching the Scriptures, and of letting the light of one portion shine upon another, till the whole subject is illuminated. This they can casily do. The Bible is at hand; and, in many cases, it is furnished with references, to facilitate comparison or examination, generally. Besides, there is an excellent little work prepared with special reference to the examination which we are now proposing. It is entitled "The Scripture Guide to Baptism: or a faithful Citation of all the passages of the New Testament which relate to this Ordinance; with the sacred Text, impartially examined, and the sense supported by numerous Extracts from the most eminent and learned Writers. To which is added a short examination of the Rise and Grounds of Infant Baptism. By R. Pengilly." It is written with care and with candor. It breathes the spirit of Christian love and fidelity. And the author, in his final address to the candid and pious inquirer, says: "Do not allow the observations contained in this pamphlet to influence you in the smallest degree, on a subject of so sacred a nature. I would advise you to peruse the passages of Scripture again, omitting all the rest; and then form your sentiments, and govern your practice, by the pure unerring word, and that alone."

There is also another help which ought to be mentioned in this connection. It is the Rev. Dr. Hackett's Brief Statement of the best established Results at which Biblical Interpreters have arrived respecting Infant Baptism. It may be found in a small volume entitled *Baptismal Tracts for the Times.**

^{*} See also his Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (xvi: 15), second edition, pp. 259-261.

He introduces the statement by saying, "No decision in biblical criticism, not absolutely unanimous, can be considered as better established at the present time, than that of the utter insufficiency of these passages to prove, or to justify the practice referred to, as an apostolic institution. The following testimonies of men who are admitted to possess the highest authority in regard to inquiries of this nature, may be taken as representing the attitude in which this subject now stands, as viewed in the light which the present state of biblical learning has shed upon it. It gives weight to these testimonies, that they proceed from men whose ecclesiastical position would naturally dispose them to adopt a different view; who belong to a church that practises infant baptism, and who, for the most part, contend that it is proper to adhere to it, notwithstanding their acknowledgment that the usage has no scriptural warrant."

After presenting the remarks of Meyer, Olshausen, De Wette, Neander and Rückert, Professor Hackett closes thus: "Numerous other names, hardly less distinguished, not only in this particular department of learning, but in other kindred branches, offer themselves as witnesses to the same effect. The object does not require us to extend the enumeration. The extracts presented above may be taken as exhibiting the prevalent view of the ablest authorities, at the present time, in regard to the question here discussed. We are authorized to say, that the opinion that Infant Baptism has any legitimate sanction from any passage in the New Testament is no longer a tenable opinion at the bar of Biblical criticism."

DR. BUSHNELL'S ARGUMENTS FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

V

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

But Dr. Bushnell has recourse to another tribunal, and proceeds thus: "Lastly, it remains to glance at the evidences from church history, or the history of the times subsequent to

the age of the apostles. It has been the mood of Christian learning, in the generation past-for the learned men have moods and phases, not to say fashions, like others in the less thoughtful conditions—to make large concessions in the matter of baptism, both as regards the manner and the subjects. But a reaction is now begun, and it is my fixed conviction that it will not stop, till the encouragement heretofore given to the Baptist opinions is quite taken away. It has never been questioned, however, that infant baptism became the current practice of the church at a very early date. It is mentioned, incidentally and otherwise, in the writings of the earliest church fathers after the age of the apostles. Thus it is testified by Justin Martyr, who was probably born before the death of the apostle John: 'There are many of us, of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who were made desciples from their childhood'; and the word made disciples is the same that Christ himself used, when he said, 'Go, teach [i.e. disciple] all nations, baptizing, &c.; the same that was currently applied to baptized children afterwards."

The representation here that the phrase were made disciples signifies were baptized, is an error, which Mr. Wall and his followers have labored strenuously to maintain, but which is sufficiently refuted by John iv: 1, where the Pharisees are mentioned as having heard 'that Jesus made and baptized more disciples that John.' The making of disciples is there presented as one thing; and the baptizing of them as another. The true interpretation is put beyond all question, also, by a treatise on baptism, found among the works of the celebrated Greek ecclesiastical Father, Basil the Great. The treatise consists of two books or parts. At the head of the first chapter of the first book, the author places the proposition, That it is requisite, first to become a disciple of the Lord, and then to be accounted worthy of the holy baptism.* He quotes the command given to the apostles, and remarks, "The Lord commanded first, Disciple all the nations, and then added,

^{* &}quot;Οτι δεῖ πρῶτον μαθητευθήναι τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ τότε καταξιωθήναι τοῦ ἀγίου βαπτίσματος.

Baptizing them, and so forth. . . . We have thought it necessary," he says, "to recur to the order prescribed by the Lord, that thus also, knowing first the import of the command to disciple, then subsequently receiving the reason of the superlatively glorious baptism, ye may be well conducted to the completion, being taught to observe all things whatsoever the Lord commanded his own disciples." *

Other Greek ecclesiastical writers explain and use the expression in the same sense, that is, as having reference to those who are capable of receiving instruction. Why, in a case like this, should we doubt their ability to understand their own language?

And then, as to the expression, 'from their childhood,' or from children (ἐπαίδων), we have only to remember that the Greek word, as well as the English word, is in itself, very indefinite, and is spoken of all ages from infancy up to full grown youth. Who does not know that it is to be explained according to the connection in which it is used? And here it is used in connection with a word which Greek writers themselves explain as indicating ability to hear, believe and obey. Besides, in Luke viii: 5, and 54, it is used with reference to the daughter who is mentioned in the 42nd verse as being about twelve years of age; and in Acts xx:12, it is used with reference to him who in the 9th verse is called a young man.

Justin Martyr, in his Apology for the Christians, proposes to give to the Roman Emperor an account of Christian baptism: "In what manner we dedicate ourselves to God, being new made by Christ, we will explain, lest omitting this, we should seem to be guilty of disingenuousness in the narration." Then he proceeds to present such a description as indicates clearly that the persons baptized acted deliberately and voluntarily. "As many," he says, "as are persuaded and believe that our doctrines are true, and promise to be able to live accordingly, are taught to pray, and, fasting, to ask from God forgiveness of their past sins, we praying and fasting with them. Then

^{*} Vol. II, p. 624 Ben. ed.

they are led by us to a place where there is water."* Such were the recipients of baptism; according to him, it is limited to believers,—"as many as are persuaded and believe." His character and his circumstances alike forbid the supposition that he gives only a partial and deceptive account of so important a matter as initiation into the new religion, and withholds an account which he could have given respecting the initiation of infants. His silence, therefore, on this occasion especially—to say nothing of his silence elsewhere, throughout his works—shows that there was then no infant baptism to be described. Let it now be recollected that his Apology for the Christians, in which his particular account of baptism occurs, was written and presented to the emperor Antoninus Pius, about the year 140, or near the middle of the second century.

In view of the facts to which we have adverted, our readers will not be surprised to find that the author of the recent elaborate work on the Life, Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr, still makes the following large concessions: "Whenever Justin refers to baptism, adults appear as the objects to whom the sacred rite is administered. Of an infant baptism he knows nothing. The traces of it, which some persons believe they have detected in his writings, are groundless fancies, artificially produced. In the words, 'Many men and many women, sixty and seventy years old, who, from children, have been disciples of Christ, preserve their continence,' nothing more is said than that many individuals of both sexes became disciples of Christ in early life. The idea of being discipled (μαθητεύεσθαι) does not necessarily include that of being baptized; it merely brings before our mind a catechumenate. And even admitting that the baptismal rite

^{*} First Apology or Defence, c. 61, p. 79, among Justini et Martyris Opera quae extant omnia, Paris ed., A. D. 174 2. "Ον τρόπον δὲ και ἀνεθήκαμεν ἐαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ, καινοποιηθέντες διὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἐξηγησόμεθα· ὅπως μὴ τοῦτο παραλιπόντες δόξωμεν πονηρεῦειν τι ἐν τῷ ἐξηγήσει. "Οσοι ἀν πειθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσι ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑψ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἰναι, καὶ βιοῦν οῦτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, εὐχεσθαι τε καὶ ἀιτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἀφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμων συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστενόντων αὐτοῖς. ἔπειτα ἀγονται ὑψ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὑδωρ ἐστι.

was included in being discipled, this by no means is decisive of a reference to infant baptism. From children (ἐκπαίδων) contrasted with sixty and seventy years old, may well denote the entrance on the period of youth." *

Next, a passage is quoted from Irenæus, who wrote in the latter part of the second century. In this, Irenæus speaks of all as being regenerated unto God; infants, and little children, and lads, and young men, and older persons. Dr. Bushnell remarks, "In the phrase regenerated unto God, which is thus applied to infants, expressly named as distinguished from little children, he refers, it cannot be doubted, to baptism; which, being the outward sign of such inward grace, was naturally and very properly called regeneration. Infants plainly could be regenerated to God in no other sense; and therefore his language cannot even be supposed to have any meaning, if this be rejected."

Had Dr. Bushnell examined all that remains of the works of Irenæus, he would himself, we think, have been convinced that the phrase now under consideration has no reference to infant baptism. The result of such an examination, made for the purpose of ascertaining the import of this phrase, was published at Andover, in the Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review for November, 1849. The writer shows that, "according to Irenæus, Christ, in becoming incarnate and thus assuming his mediatorial work, brought the human family into a new relation, under Himself, and placed them in a condition in which they can be saved. In this sense, He is the Saviour of all. He restored them, or summed them up anew in Himself. He became, so to speak, a second Adam, the regenerator of mankind. Through him they are regenerated unto God: per eum renascuntur in Deum. The thought occurs frequently; and it is variously modified by the various connections in which it is introduced." The assumption that Irenæus is here speaking of baptism is shown to be unautho-

^{*}Justin Martyr: His Life, Writings and Opinions; by the Rev. Charles Semisch, of Trebnitz, Silesia; translated from the German, with the author's concurrence, by J. E. Ryland. Vol. II, p. 334 and 335.

rized. "The context is against it; for the context directs our attention to *Christ* and what He Himself, personally, came to do for the human family. It is by *Him*, and not by baptism, that they are here said to be renewed, born anew, or regenerated. And parallel passages are against it; for they abundantly confirm the sense already given, asbeing the true sense of the passage before us."

For the overwhelming evidence adduced we refer our readers to the article itself.*

In regard to Tertullian, at Carthage in Africa, towards the end of the second century and in the early part of the third, Dr. Bushnell represents that his opposition to infant baptism supposes the current practice of such baptism at the time. But, manifestly, it supposes only that, in his circle, what he opposed had begun to be practised. Nothing more than this is proved, unless in his opposition, he uses some expressions that imply the currency of the practice. Does any such evidence appear? Not at all. He is showing that baptism is not to be given rashly. "Give to every one that asketh thee," he adds, "has its proper subject, and relates to almsgiving; but that command rather is here to be considered, 'Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine; and that, 'Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's faults.' . . Therefore, according to the condition and disposition and age of each person, the delaying of baptism is more beneficial, especially in the case of little ones. For what need is there that sponsors be brought into danger? They, through death, may fail of fulfilling their promises, or they may be defrauded by the coming forth of a bad disposition. The Lord does indeed say, Forbid them not to come unto me. Therefore let them come while they are growing up; let them come while they are learning, while they are being taught whither they are coming. Let them be made Christians [be identified by baptism with

^{*}It has more recently been published as one among the Baptismal Tracts for the Times, and is entitled, The Meaning of Irenæus in the phrase, Regenerated unto God.

the body of Christians], when they shall have been able to know Christ. Why hastens the innocent age to the remission of sins? More caution will be used in secular matters; so that to whom earthly treasure is not intrusted, heavenly may be intrusted! Let them learn to desire salvation, that you may appear to have given to him that asketh."

So far is this appeal or expostulation from supposing and proving the current or general practice of infant baptism, that Neander mentions it as "a proof that the practice had not yet come to be regarded as an apostolic institution; for otherwise he would hardly have ventured to express himself so strongly against it." "Tertullian," he adds, "evidently means, that children should be led to Christ by instructing them in Christianity; but that they should not receive baptism until, after having been sufficiently instructed, they are led, from personal conviction and by their own free choice, to seek for it with sincere longing of the heart." *

Here let it be distinctly noted that Tertullian was speaking, not of infants properly so called, but of little ones (parvuli) who had sufficient maturity to be taught lessons of Christian truth and duty. This was perceived by Bunsen, so distinguished as an investigator of civil and of ecclesiastical antiquities; and, in the work entitled Hippolytus and his Age, he says, "Tertullian's opposition is to the baptism of young, growing children; he does not say a word about new-born infants; neither does Origen, when his expressions are accurately weighed."

From Origen, in Egypt, at Alexandria, in the first half of the third century, Dr. Bushnell adduces the two passages which have usually been quoted, and which at first seems to be decisive, in favor of infant baptism. But these have come down to us, not in the original Greek, but only in a transla-

tion made by hands accustomed to take great liberties in preparing Greek works for Latin readers. Other passages, some of which are still extant in the original Greek, are deci-

† Vol. II. p. 115, (2nd Ed.)

^{*} History of the Christian Religion and Church. Vol. I, r. 312.

sive against infant baptism. In the space which we can here occupy, it would be impossible to present the facts, so as to do justice to the apparently conflicting passages, and to all the persons concerned. But we are happy in being able to assure our readers that, in the Christian Review for April, 1854, they can find a somewhat extended discussion, entitled, The Testimony of Origen respecting the Baptism of Children. It closes with these words: "We have endeavored to call forth Origen himself, as it were, and let him give his own testimony. This has been uttered in his own language, the Greek, as well as in translation, so far as it respects the principal passages and several of the others. No room is left for suspicion of fraud, or spuriousness. If we have fallen into error at any point, may we be set right. If passages, which have commonly been supposed to favor infant baptism, have been satisfactorily reconciled by us with passages which decidedly exclude it, all is well. But if this has not been done, and a passage existing only in a translation, or liable to some suspicion of spuriousness, is at variance with a passage existing still in the original Greek, or liable to no such suspicion, it is clear that preference must be given to the authority of the passage still existing in the original, or liable to no suspicion. The conclusion is easy and inevitable: - Origen should never be quoted in support of infant baptism. He testifies, not only indirectly, but also directly and expressly, in regard to children as well as others, that, before being baptized, they were to be taught, and to give evidence of having duly heeded the voice of Christian instruction.

"Somewhere in the first two centuries," says Dr. Bushnell, "the ancient writing called the Shepherd, or the Shepherd of Hermas, because it purports to have been written by a teacher of that name, declares the opinion that 'all infants are in honor with the Lord, and are esteemed first of all—the baptism of water is necessary to all."

This very remarkable passage seems to declare that all infants must be baptized. But let us examine it a little. In the first place, the word infants is here used, doubtless, not in the strictest sense, but so as to correspond to the words

used where it is said that young children received the Saviour's blessing, or where He called a little child to Him, and set him in the midst of his disciples, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven; whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven,' or where the apostle Paul says, In malice be ye children. The phrase 'all infants,' in this connection, must mean all childlike persons; or, as Archbishop Wake has well expressed the sense of these words, "all such children." His translation of the whole paragraph, in which this phrase occurs, is as follows: "Whosoever, therefore, said he [the Shepherd] shall continue as children without malice, shall be more honorable than all those of whom I have yet spoken; for all such children are honored by the Lord, and esteemed the first of all. Happy, therefore, are ye who shall remove all malice from you, and put on innocence; because ye shall first see the Lord."

But where is the latter part of Dr. Bushnell's quotation? The nearest resemblance of it that can be found is at the distance of more than ten pages, where the Shepherd is explaining what appear in the vision as stones, representing the ancient patriarchs, coming out of the deep, and being placed in the building of the tower. "It was necessary, said he, for them to ascend by water, that they might be at rest. For they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of God, but by laying aside the mortality of their former life. They, therefore, being dead, were nevertheless sealed with the seal of the Son of God, and so entered into the kingdom of God. For before a man receives the name of the Son of God, he is ordained unto death; but when he receives that seal, he is freed from death, and assigned unto life. Now that seal is the water of baptism, into which men go down under the obligation unto death, but come up appointed unto life. Wherefore to those also was this seal preached, and they made use of it, that they might enter into the kingdom of God. And I said, Why, then, sir, did these forty stones also ascend with them out of the deep, having already received

that seal? He answered, Because these apostles and teachers, who preached the name of the Son of God, dying after they had received his faith and power, preached to them who were dead before, and they gave this seal to them. They went down therefore into the water with them, and again came up. But these went down whilst they were alive, and came up again alive; whereas those who were before dead, went down dead, but came up alive. Through these, therefore, they received life, and knew the Son of God; for which cause they came up with them, and were fit to come into the building of the tower, and were not cut, but put in entire; because they died in righteousness, and in great purity; only this seal was wanting to them. Thus you have the explanation of these things."

The author of the writing here quoted, misapprehending the words of our Lord in the third chapter of John, has such an impression of the necessity and efficacy of baptism that he dreams of the ancient patriarchs' being baptized in the state of the dead. The apostles must go to the invisible abode of the departed, and preach to them, and give them the seal of the Son of God, the water of baptism. His work, as we have already had occasion to remark, was written, probably, about the middle of the second century. It breathes a lovely spirit of christian kindness, zeal, humility, and conscientiousness. It has a charm somewhat like that of the Pilgrim's Progress. Glowing with piety as well as with imagination, and containing many wholesome admonitions, and much important truth mingled with some pernicious error, it was widely circulated; and it could not fail of having a great influence, both for good and for evil, on the Christian community in the second, and third, and subsequent centuries. As, with all its excellencies, it seems to contain some of the seminal principles which led, at length, to the Romish doctrines of supererogation, penance, and purgatory, so it contains the seminal principles which with other influences, led at length, to the baptism of infants, namely, the absolute necessity and mysterious efficacy of baptism. But it contains no intimation that the baptism of infants had already begun to be practised.

Men often adopt principles which it is easier to hold as theories, than to apply and carry out in real life; especially when institutes, either divine or human, and the usages of a numerous and widely extended community stand in the way. Often, too, men apply a principle in one direction, without applying it in others to which it is equally applicable. Time and favoring circumstances are requisite in order to diffuse and establish the principle, to awaken sufficient interest in its application, and to overcome all the obstacles. Thus the visionary and theoretical baptism of the ancient patriarchs in the state of the dead, preceded, a considerable length of time, the actual baptism of dying babes.

In the first part of the short sentence which is presented as a quotation from the words ascribed to Hermas, nothing is said of baptism; and in the second part nothing is said of children. If Dr. Bushnell wishes to use Hermas as an authority for the absolute necessity of baptism, especially in regard to the holy patriarchs, after they had departed from this world, we do not think it needful to detain our readers by making any particular objection.

We pass to the evidence for infant baptism which he derives from inscriptions on the monuments of children, "considered," he remarks, "by antiquarians to be of a very early age, probably of the first two or three centuries, in which they are called fideles, that is, faithfuls, just as children are addressed by Paul among the 'faithful brethren' of Ephesus and Colosse. The following is an example—(Buonavotti, 17; Fabretti, cap. 4.) 'a faithful among faithfuls, here lies Zosimus. He lived two years one month and twenty-five days.'"

Sometimes a bright and lovely child, no older than this, has begun to think and to speak, to ask questions and to make replies, in a manner that has touched the heart of a pious parent. The dear little one says that he loves the Lord Jesus Christ that died for him, and he can repeat the creed, and make the responses required of the candidate for baptism. The child mentioned in the inscription, if all that is claimed in this case

be reliable, had, indeed, a maturity that is rare and admirable in one so young. His being numbered so early among the faithful, that is, the believing, was remarkable. It somewhat exceeded even the earliest limit mentioned in a celebrated sermon by Gregory Nazianzen, when bishop of Constantinople, near the close of the fourth century. After urging on the people the importance of being baptized, he adds: "But what, it may be asked, would you say concerning those who are yet infants, not comprehending either the detriment or the benefit? Shall we baptize these also? By all means, if any danger be imminent; for it is better that they be sanctified without their knowing it, than that they die without being sealed and initiated. . . . But concerning the others I recommend thatwaiting three years, either a little less or a little more, when they are able to hear and answer somewhat that pertains to the ordinance, though not understanding perfectly, yet receiving impressions,-you thus sanctify both their souls and their bodies by the great mystery of initiation."*

The age of little Zosimus was a few days less than two years and two months. Instead of being almost three, he was only a little more than two years old. This made his case specially interesting. It constituted a memorable distinction; and, as a distinction, as something extraordinary, it might be inscribed on his monument. Moreover, had all children of believers, as a matter of course, been baptized, there would have been no occasion to speak of his pre-eminence in this respect.

Thus much we might say, even if all that has been claimed for the argument from monumental inscriptions ought to be admitted. But we think that there is an impropriety in the

^{*} Τί δ'ἀν ἐιποῖς περὶ τῶν ἔτι νηπίων, καὶ μήτε τῆς ζημίας ἐπαισθανομένων, μήτε τῆς χάριτος ἡ καιξταῦτα βαπτίσομεν; πάνυ γε, εῖπέρ τις ἐπειγη κίνδυνος. κρεῖσον γὰρ ἀναισθήτως ἀγιασθήναι ἡ απελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα καὶ ἀτέλεστα . . . περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων δίδωμι γνωμην, τὴν τριετίαν ἀναμένοντας, ἡ μικρὸν ἐντὸς τούτον, ἡ ὑπερ τοῦτο, ἡνίκα καὶ ἀκουσαὶ τί μυστικὸν καὶ ἀποκρίνεσθαι δυνατόν, ἐι καὶ μὴ συνιέντα τελείως, άλλ' οἰν τυπούμενα, οὕτως ἀγιάζειν καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ σωματα τω μεγάλω μυστηρίω τῆς τελειώσεως. Orat. XL. Works of Gregory Nazianzen, Vol. I. p. 658. Paris, 1609.

inscription adduced by Dr. Bushnell. We allude to the improper and unjustifiable manner in which the word believer, or faithful (fidelis), is used; and respecting this we shall soon have occasion to speak more fully. In the next place, we cannot admit that the epitaphs to which he refers are of so early an age as to furnish a valid argument for proving infant baptism to be a part of primitive Christianity.

Natural caves and subterranean excavations, whether at Rome or elsewhere, we have reason to believe, were occasionally used by Christians in times of early persecution, as places of refuge, and where religious services might be performed, especially on days commemorating the death of martyrs. How early they were used as cemeteries it is impossible now to ascertain.

In the peaceful times under the emperor Alexander Severus (A. D. 222—235), Calixtus, the bishop of Rome, enlarged one of the subterranean vaults, and furnished it with conveniences for performing worship and religious rites. It is the cemetery of Calixtus under the magnificent church of St. Sebastian; and it first received the name catacomb, a name afterwards applied to other underground burying places. One of his successors, Sextus II., and four deacons, were put to death in this cemetery, in accordance with the persecuting edict of Valerian, in the year 258.*

Maximinus, in 311, forbade the Christians to enter the subterranean places of burial.† But Constantine the Great, about the year 313, restored to them their cemeteries and chapels.‡ And from his time, the burial places were prepared with increased forethought and system. They could be visited without fear of molestation; and they were honored more and more, in connection with the increasing honor paid to martyrs. Wherever the body of a martyr was deposited, his sympathizing brethren would love to repair, and strengthen their own

^{*}See Cypriani Epist. ad Successum, &c., LXXXII. Ben. ed. p. 165—Xistum autem in cemeterio animadversum sciatis octavo iduum Augustarum die, et cum eo diacones quatuor.

[†]Euseb. Eccles. Hist. B. IX. ch. 2; and B. VII. ch. 11. ‡Euseb. Life of Constantine, B. II. ch. 40.

faith by meditation and religious services. It was natural and commendable to desire for themselves, and for their kindred and friends, a quiet resting place near the graves of those dear and honored ones whose precious remains were already sleeping there. When the convenience of the people in the vicinity, and of the multitudes attracted to the holy place required it, a church edifice, over the place of subterranean repose could be erected, having an easy and safe communication with the vaults beneath.

In Rome, for several ages, till after the middle of the fifth century, the bishops were buried in the catacombs. Leo, denominated the Great, was the first exception. In the year 462 he was buried, not in a catacomb, but in the vestibule of the vestry at St. Peter's. Persons of distinction followed his example. Many were buried in the courts of the city churches, or in the sepulchres connected with them. The common people still continued to be buried in the catacombs. But the example of the superior classes had great influence. And when, for suitable honor, the bones of the martyrs themselves were removed to the city churches, the zeal for the former places of burial died away. The places were comparatively neglected. They fell into a state unfit for use; and in the seventh or eighth century they ceased entirely to be used as cemeteries, and were almost forgotten amidst the public calamities of the times.*

In 1535 some of those dark and dilapidated caverns were explored. A deep interest was awakened. Bosio, a zealous antiquary, spent more than thirty years, the last thirty years of the sixteenth century, in clearing away the rubbish, and penetrating into recesses that had been blocked up for ages. His work in Italian, on Subterranean Rome, was translated into latin and enlarged by Arringhi, in two folio volumes, published at Paris in 1659. Since that time there have appeared several other interesting and, in various respects, valuable works on discoveries made in the catacombs.

Among these discoveries are inscriptions on the monuments

^{*}See Arringhi, Roma Subterranea, Tom. II., p. 221.

of children. Some years ago in a volume entitled Apostolic Baptism, an array of these inscriptions, gathered from Bosio, Arringhi, Muratori, Buonavotti, Fabretti, Gruter and Boldetti, was presented to the public for the purpose of proving the apostolic authority of infant baptism. We welcome any competent and credible witnesses that can be summoned. Let the dead rise from their graves. Let them be called forth from the catacombs. Their testimony may be valuable concerning the times in which they lived. But let us not be so unreasonable as to expect them to testify concerning what was done in times long before they existed, or in spheres beyond their knowledge.

The volume to which we allude presents us thirty-two inscriptions respecting children. Ten are called believers (fideles). And the age of these, except only that of Zosimus (the case adduced as an example by Dr. Bushnell), exceeds the age at which Gregory Nazianzen recommends that children be baptized, as being "able to hear and answer somewhat that pertains to the ordinance; though not understanding perfectly, yet receiving impressions." Four are mentioned as being "with the holy," or "with holy spirits." One is mentioned as being "in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." One, at the age of four years, five months, and three days, is mentioned, expressly, as a catechumen, "resting in peace." One, who died soon after the beginning of the fourth century, a little more than eleven years of age, is spoken of without any mention of baptism; for it is too much to assume that this is implied in his having two names, Simplicia and Colonymus. Frequently a person had more than one name, and was called sometimes by one of them, and sometimes by the other. The inscription itself, in the present case, says nothing of martyrdom, or of violence. Fifteen are designated as newly baptized.

Of two brothers, one, who died at the age of seven years, is called a *believer* (fidelis); and the other, who died at the age of somewhat more than eight years, is said to be *newly baptized*. That is, one child, a lad of seven years, had received baptism before he was seized with his last and fatal sickness;

another, in the same family, a lad of eight years and more, not having received it previously, received it now, probably in view of his danger, and thus he dies newly baptized. The time of his death, it is important to remember, was about the end of the fourth century, A. D. 394. What was the case with him was, doubtless, in effect, the case with most of the rest of the fifteen who are mentioned as newly baptized; and more than half of them were more than six years of age. Hence more than half of them were not baptized before arriving at that degree of maturity.

Thus, it will be perceived, when we examine and analyze the evidence derived from these thirty-two witnesses, that instead of proving the apostolic authority of infant baptism, it harmonizes with, and confirms, our representations. Whatever might be the dreams of such sincere and attractive writers as Hermas, or the theories adopted by many zealous churchteachers, the practice of baptizing infants came in but yesterday. Some, through the influence of erroneous views that were coming to prevail, were hastened to baptism, "though understanding imperfectly," or even not at all. More were kept waiting several years ;-some for an increased degree of maturity and preparation, and some for an increased probability of retaining the grace which was supposed to be received with that great remedy for all previous sin; -but were baptized when danger of death was imminent, and thus died newly baptized. Some were not baptized at all; and yet, like the catechumen mentioned, were believed by their kindred and guardians to be "resting in peace," or "with the holy," through the grace of Him who had said of other little ones that had not been baptized, " Of such is the kingdom of heaven." see the sail of the contract of the contract of the contract of

Here we might confidently leave the argument from the inscriptions on the monuments of children. But we have more to say respecting the case of Zosimus; and we wish to let our readers see how the argument stands in the light of some additional discoveries.

In the recent French work, by M. Louis Perret, on the Catacombs of Rome, we have a highly valuable contribution

to the history of ancient Christian art, and of some things connected with it. The work consists of six folio volumes; five of plates and fac-similes, and one of descriptions. It is exact, comprehensive, and splendid. Among other interesting objects it presents nearly ninety epitaphs or inscriptions respecting children. Only nine of these make any reference to baptism; and five of this small number are included also among the thirty-two whose testimony we have already considered. Three children are mentioned as newly baptized. They died, one at the age of two years, five months, and twenty five days; one, of one year and ten months; and one apparently of eighty days, though the inscription is very imperfect and uncertain.

Besides these two or three cases, in which it appears that a child was baptized when about to die, another is mentioned in which a child (very improperly, we think,) is spoken of as a believer (fidelis). Florentius has made an inscription to his well deserving son Apronianus, who lived a year and nine months, tive days. As he was much loved by his grandmother, and she saw that he was about to die, she requested of the church that he might depart from the world a believer.*

Here, manifestly, the church was supposed to possess a mysterious power; and the dying child was to be prepared by it not, indeed, to grow up in the faith of his parents, as Dr. Bushnell would say, but to depart from the world a believer. Was this in accordance with the Saviour's command, and with apostolic doctrine and practice?

When were the inscriptions written? This can be ascertained in regard to those which mention the Roman consuls at the time, and hence have been called consular. In regard to the others, there is uncertainty. The earliest of all the consular inscriptions said to have been found in the catacombs

^{*}Florentius filio suo Aproniano fecit titulum bene merenti, q (ui) vixit annum et menses nove(m), dies quinque. Cum soldu amatus fuisset a majore sua, et vidit hunc morti constitutum esse, petivit de ecclesia ut fidelis de seculo recessisset.

is one that corresponds with our A. D. 98; * the next earliest, A. D. 107; and then one, A. D. 111. These three are presented by Boldetti as having been found in one of the oldest cemeteries, that of St. Lucina, on the Ostian way, connected with the subterranean chapel which, as we have already stated, was enlarged and fitted up by Calixtus, in the first part of the third century. It seems evident, therefore, that in the second century the catacombs, to some extent, were used by Christians as places for burying their dead. But those earliest inscriptions, it must be borne in mind, say nothing respecting baptism. The earliest allusion to the baptism of a child is A. D. 348, the child being at the age of six years, eight months, and eleven days, newly baptized. The next earliest is A. D. 371, the child being at the age of eight years and fifteen days, newly baptized; and the next after this, A. D. 374, the child being at the age of eight years, newly baptized. All these, it will be perceived, occur in the fourth century. Besides these, there are twelve consular inscriptions relative to children, without any mention of baptism; eight in the fourth century; three in the fifth; and one in the sixth.

Dr. Bushnell speaks of the inscriptions without discrimination; and he supposes them to be "of a very early age, probably of the first two or three centuries." But a careful examination proves that the very example which he has selected, namely, the epitaph of Zosimus, could have had no existence till a considerable time after the beginning of the fourth century.

This inscription is preserved in the gallery of the Vatican at Rome. It was taken from the cemetery of St. Agnes. This holy young maiden and martyr was a victim of the persecution under the emperor Diocletian, according to Fleury, in the year 304, and, according to Ruinart, in the year 306. She

^{*} D. M.

P. Liberio vixit ani n. II. menses n. III. dies n. VIII. R. Anicio Fausto et Virio Gallo coss.

was condemned to be dishonored in one of those caverns of the race course that served as a brothel. For her faith and firmness she was beheaded. Her martyrdom was the occasion of establishing there, in due time, services of devout commemoration; and there, at length, came to be the consecrated cemetery and the renowned church of St. Agnes.*

A fac-simile of the Greek original of the inscription which has occasioned these remarks, is presented by Perret in his splendid work on the Catacombs of Rome. It is one of the nearly ninety that we have mentioned. The following is a literal translation:—A believer descended from believers (πιστὸς ἐχ πιστῶν) I Zosimus lie here, having lived two years, one month, and twenty-five days.

Respecting the improper and unjustifiable manner in which the word believer is here used, we shall soon, as we have already intimated, have an opportunity of speaking more fully than we have yet done. The record before us, in whatever manner it may be explained, cannot testify for the times in which the apostles lived. It is far too late. It must now be acknowledged by all to be at least considerably later than the beginning of the fourth century; for the time and the circumstances of the martyrdom of St. Agnes preclude the possibility of supposing the earlier existence of a Christian cemetery in the subterranean haunts of revelry and licentiousness near the race course.

In the same discourse, at Constantinople, from which we made a quotation, Gregory Nazianzen, speaking of various classes of persons who die without baptism, mentions one class as being those whose failure of being baptized is on account of infancy;—from ignorance.† These, he thinks, will be neither glorified nor punished by the righteous Judge. The passage to which we now allude, and the manner in which in the former one, he recommends the baptism of children, show that it was not uncommon in his time for children to

^{*}See Fledry, Histoire Ecclesiastique, Liv. VIII., Tom. II., p. 485. Ruinart, Acta sincera, p. 504; and Description of Rome, (Beschreibung der Stadt Rom) by Platner, Bunsen, Gerhood, and Röstell, vol. I., p. 401.

[†] διὰ νηπιότητα.—εξ άγνοίας. Vol. I. p. 653.

emain unbaptized on account of infancy, which, for the most part, naturally involves a state of ignorance. He himself, though born after his father became a bishop, and most carefully educated, it is well known, was not baptized till he arrived at a period of maturity. The deferring of his baptism, surely, could not have arisen from any desire that he might continue to sin as long as possible. And his recommending to defer the baptism of children, except when danger of death is imminent, till "they are able to hear and answer somewhat that pertains to the ordinance," surely also, could not have arisen from any desire that they might continue to sin as long as possible. No. It must have arisen from a yet lingering impression of what was originally required and was according to primitive usage.

If "baptism was sometimes deferred on superstitious grounds, till severe illness; even in the hope of sinning with less danger till the performance of the rite;"—this was one of the fruits of mistaking the design of baptism, and unwarrantably ascribing to the baptismal act a mysterious efficacy; while the same prolific error, the ascribing of a mysterious, saving efficacy to the baptismal act, urged its being prematurely performed on the unprepared, and especially on the dying child. Between the unjustifiable delaying and the unjustifiable hastening of baptism there was a middle course, which, to say the least, many would gladly have followed.

Maitland, in his work entitled, The Church in the Catacombs, furnishes us with six epitaphs of children, not included
among those which we have enumerated. One of the children
died at the age of a year and nine months, newly baptized.
In connection with the five others, no mention is made of
baptism. One of these is expressly mentioned as a catechumen, who lived nine years, eight months, and twenty-two
days. Of course it is certain that this child was not baptized,
but was receiving preparatory religious instruction. He gives
also an epitaph, included among those which we have already
examined, that of a child who died at the age of three years
and thirty days, newly baptized; and he remarks that "her
extreme youth proves the custom of infant baptism."* We

^{*}P. 281, London, 1847.

learn, from another source, that the child died A. D. 367. And he might well have said, the evidence here proves that, in the latter part of the fourth century, a child three years old, had not been baptized, but being then about to die, there was administered to her the ceremony which was supposed by many to have, in such an extremity, the wondrous power of securing eternal salvation.

In regard to the case decided by the Council over which Cyprian presided, at Carthage, in Northern Africa, about the middle of the third century, we need only call the attention of our readers to one consideration. We allude to what is disclosed by the nature of the case presented for decision. We say nothing here respecting the merits of the decision itself, which was, that no one, however young, was to be debarred from baptism and the grace of God, and thus be lost. The question was, whether baptism was ever to be administered before the eighth day after the birth of a child, or whether it was not rather to follow the law of circumcision, in this respect. Now, if infant baptism had been in use all along from the first, instances innumerable must have occurred in which infants, especially those in special danger of death before their eighth day, were baptized before that day. The usage, in such circumstances, must have been known; and there could have been no occasion for discussing and deciding the matter. Infant baptism, then, could not have been of long standing. It must have been just coming into existence; for it needed to be regulated as no institute properly established and well known could have needed.

But, though we regard the consideration here presented, as more than a sufficient reply to all that has been, and all that can be, urged in favor of infant baptism from the decision of this council at Carthage, a little after the middle of the third century, yet it may be useful to mention a few additional facts pertaining to the subject.

1. It is here that the baptism of infants, or babes, makes its first appearance in ecclesiastical history. 2. Cyprian, in his epistle to Fidus, in the name of the Council, does not place the decision on the ground of any ordinance of our Lord, or of

any tradition from the apostles. 3. He does place it on the ground "that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to none born of man. For since the Lord says in his gospel: The son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them, as far as in us lies, if it can be, no soul must be lost." 4. From this epistle it is perfectly manifest that he regarded the administration of baptism as the bestowing of salvation. 5. He believed, as is abundantly evident from other writings of his, that still in his time there were new revelations, and that what was then revealed, or could be shown to be lawful and conducive to salvation, ought to supersede what had already been practised, "for which thing," he says, "Paul also, looking forward and faithfully consulting concord and peace, laid down the rule in his epistle, saying: But let the prophets speak two or three; and let the others judge. But if any thing be revealed to another sitting by, let the former one be silent. Here he taught and showed that many things are revealed to individuals for the better, and that each ought not pertinaciously to contend for what he once imbibed and held; but willingly embrace it, if anything better or more useful be presented.*

In this passage Cyprian is defending his course in regard to the baptizing of heretics, but the principle is equally applicable to other subjects. He, and unnumbered thousands of his contemporaries, had imbibed the opinion that baptism was necessary for salvation to all, even to the unconscious infant. He claimed to have visions and revelations. Through his zeal, his glowing eloquence, his high ecclesiastical position, and his consummate skill in storms of controversy, his influence was powerful while he lived; and, when he died a martyr, it became immense. It extended itself to distant countries, and it has continued to be felt, from generation to generation,

^{*} Cui rei Paulus quoque prospiciens et concordiae et paci fideliter consulens in epistola sua posuit dicens; Prophetae autem duo aut tres loquantur, et caeteri examinent. Si autem alii revelatum fuerit sedenti, ille prior taceat. Qua in parte docuit et ostendit multa singulis in melius revelari et debere unumquemque non pro eo quod semel imbiberat et tenebat pertinaciter congredi, sed si quid melius et utilius extiterit libenter amplecti. Epist. to Quintus; 71. Comp. Epist. to Pompeius; 74. Ben. ed.

down to the present time. He thought himself inspired, and thus entitled to give new directions promotive of salvation; and, doubtless, he supposed that the Holy Spirit guided the bishops, especially when assembled in full council.* With these views, he could not fail of being prompted by all the compassionate feelings of his ardent mind to make the most strenuous efforts in favor of what seemed to him so important and efficacious an expedient.

In other countries, the same opinion that baptism is absolutely necessary to all for salvation, was more and more generally admitted; and it was producing its effects in various ways. One of the most remarkable of these is the impress that it has left on that singular product of the third and fourth centuries, the work claiming to be the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles. In this work we hear, as it were, an imploring voice for the infants; while Ambrose, the renowned bishop of Milan, in the fourth century, utters the prevalent conviction of his times in the following authoritative terms: " No one ascends into the kingdom of heaven, but through the sacrament of baptism. . . . There is no exception even of an infant, or of a person prevented by any necessity. Such may not be openly and positively punished; but I have no assurance that they may participate in the honor of the kingdom."+

Still, in most parts of christendom, a deep impression was prevalent that faith was requisite in order to be baptized, as well as that baptism was requisite in order to be admitted into heaven. With such impressions, who that had parental affection would not have special desire, who would not earn-

^{*}Writing to Cornelius in the name of a council, he says: "We have decided, the Holy Spirit suggesting, and the Lord by many and plain visions admonishing, &c. Placuit nobis, Sancto Spiritu suggerente, et Domino per visiones multas et manifestas admonente. Epist. LIV. Ben. ed. p. 79. See also the Oxford translation of his Epistles, p. 208; and compare p. 87.

t De Abrah, lib. ii. c. 11. Nemo adscendit in regnum cœlorum, nisi per sacramentum baptismatis. . . . Utique nullum excipit, non infantem, non aliqua praeventum necessitate. Habeant tamen illam opertam poenarum immunitatem; nescio an habeant regni honorem. The Works of Ambrose Tom. i., pp. 347 and 351. Paris, 1686.

estly pray, that the dear little ones might arrive at that state in which, as Origen expresses it, they could be made capable of receiving the grace of Christ? Passages occurring in some of the early Christian writers help us to understand the prayers that were offered for the infants, whether of the church or of the catechumens. These prayers, except the one which is recorded by Chrysostom as having been used by the church at Antioch, and which is in remarkable harmony with the others, are still found in the liturgical part of the Eighth Book of the Constitutions; a part which, as to its general frame-work and many of its materials, has evident marks of having been derived from ancient usage in that venerable and influential church. These prayers, though in their present form, written not earlier, probably, than the fourth century, were intended and adapted to be received as having come down from a much earlier period. They touch a tender chord in the heart of the Christian parent, and shed an unexpected light on the history of Infant Baptism. They show that infants were not baptized. For the burden of these prayers is, that the little ones may be brought to such an age and state as to receive baptism,—this being a 'sacrament for the believers,'* without which it was generally supposed none could inherit the bliss of heaven.

In the fifteenth chapter of the Sixth Book, immediately after an admonition on the danger of sudden death, there is an ambiguous injunction for the baptism of children: "Moreover, baptize your children, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. For He saith, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not."

The indefiniteness of the command seems to have been skilfully adapted to the securing of its reception as having been derived from the apostles. It could be explained so as to harmonize with the well known apostolic practice of Believers' Baptism. For in the days of the apostles, there were, doubtless, many christian, believing children. To have children of this character, is mentioned among the

^{*} See Origen on Exodus, Homily viii, sect. 4, and the Christian Review or April, 1854, p. 203.

qualifications of the men who were to be ordained as elders. * Children and other disciples went with Paul out of the city of Tyre, when he departed; and the company kneeled down on the shore, and prayed. + Children that give evidence of true and intelligent faith in Christ, we all agree, ought to baptized. The command now under consideration, may have had in view such young catechumens-little disciples whom the apostles would not have rejected; and, so understood, it could easily be regarded as apostolical. But as it places baptism prominently in the foreground, and leaves out of sight the grand prerequisite, it could also be explained so as to favor and sanction the baptism of children in early infancy. Its influence would, of course, be silent, but none the less powerful and extensive. It called for no public discussion, and no enactment of a council. It came quietly, as a friendly message from the apostles themselves. It was admirably fitted to co-operate with other influences leading in the same direction. And near the end of the fourth century, and in the early part of the fifth, the time of Augustine, it had been thus co-operating more than a hundred years; so that we need not wonder at his speaking of infant baptism as being supported by apostolic tradition.

Two eminent men of that time (near the end of the fourth eentury and in the early part of the fifth), Pelagius and Augustine are now introduced by Dr. Bushnell as witnesses for infant baptism. He says, "So clear, in short, and decided was the authority of infant baptism, that Pelagius, a man of great learning, who had travelled in Britain, France, Italy, Africa Proper, Egypt and Palestine, declared, in his controversy with Augustine, about the beginning of the fifth century, that he had never heard of any impious heretic or sectary, who had denied infant baptism.' 'What,' he also asked, 'can be so impious as to hinder the baptism of infants?'"

In Augustine's animadversions on the epistle which Pelagius sent, to Innocent, bishop of Rome, in his own defence (the epistle itself has been lost), we find the paragraphs rela-

^{*} Tit. i: 6.

tive to the subject before us; and, when brought together in their proper connection, they stand thus: "Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants, or promised the kingdom of heaven to some persons without the redemption of Christ; which is a thing that I never heard even any impious heretic say. For who is there so ignorant of that which is read in the gospel, as either to affirm this, or even heedlessly say such a thing, or have such a thought? In a word, who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized and born again in Christ, and so make them miss of the kingdom of heaven, since our Saviour has said that none can enter into the kingdom of heaven that is not born again of water and the Holy Spirit? Who is there so impious as to refuse to an infant, of whatever age, the common redemption of mankind, and to hinder him that is born to an uncertain life, from being born again to an everlasting and certain one?" *

We are quite willing that this testimony of Pelagius, here accurately laid before our readers, in its amplest form, be estimated according to its real value. Of this they will, perhaps, be better able to judge, after hearing and examining the testimony of the remaining witness.

"Augustine himself, also," says Dr. Bushnell. "testifies—the whole church of Christ has constantly held that infants were baptized. Infant baptism the whole church practises. It was not instituted by councils, but was ever in use."

We reply: Neander states that, "What Augustine found already existing in the general usage of the church, he believed might be derived either from apostolic tradition or the divine institution through general councils." † Infant baptism, it was well known, had not been instituted by any such council; and yet he seemed to find it everywhere practised, especially in cases of special danger of death. Therefore, he inferred it must have been derived from apostolic tradition. This, in his view, was the only alternative; and, in the work claiming to be the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, there

^{*} See Augustine, De Peccato Originali, c. 17, &c.

[†] Hist. of the Christian Rel. and Church, Vol. II., p. 664.

Vol. xxxiii. -37.

was a command to baptize children. But, surely, there was another way in which the usage, so prevalent in his time, and far more prevalent afterwards, could have entered. And we have just seen how it could and did creep in, silently and gradually. With all his logical ingenuity and all his rhetoric, he was very liable to err in regard to the early state of the churches. He quotes largely from Cyprian's Epistle to Fidus; but, we believe, he never mentions any particular authority earlier than Cyprian. The striking remark of the historian on Origen's supposed reference to apostolic tradition, applies, with more than double force, to Augustine's reference, after the lapse of more than double the length of time from the days of the apostles: "An apostolic tradition; -an expression, by the way, which cannot be regarded as of much weight in an age when the inclination was so strong to trace every institution which was considered of special importance, to the apostles; and when so many walls of separation, hiding the freedom of prospect, had already been set up between this and the apostolic age." *

Augustine resided in the northern part of Africa. In the year 315, about forty years before his birth, a council was held at Neocæsarea, in Asia Minor, far away from Africa and all the western churches. Among the canons adopted by this council, is one which was designed to remove the doubts of some in regard to the propriety of baptizing a pregnant woman, lest it might seem to involve the baptism of the child. Concerning a woman who is pregnant [we decide] that she ought to be baptized whenever she pleases; for, in this matter, the mother communicates nothing to the child, since the deliberate purpose in the profession of faith is declared each one's own. †

From this canon we obtain a glimpse of light, which, perhaps, Augustine did not possess, on the state of the eastern churches in respect to baptism in the early part of the fourth

^{*} Hists of the Christ. Rel. and Church, Vol. I., p. 314.

[†] Περὶ κυοφορούσης ὅτι δεῖ φωτίζεσθαῖ ὁπότε βούλεται· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν τούτω κοινωνεῖ ἡ τίκτουσα τω τικτομένω, ὁιὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐπὶ τῆ ὁμολογία δείκνυσθαι.

century. Here it appears that, in order to be baptized, a personal profession was expected, as a matter of course, and that, in making this profession, the deliberate purpose was manifested as being each one's own. No one could answer for another, not even the mother for the child; and the child could not answer at all. The apprehension, therefore, was groundless, that the baptism of the mother, when she was overwhelmed in the water, would involve the baptism of the child, or create a case so perplexing as to render it expedient to defer the baptism of the mother, till after the birth of the child. She could be baptized without delay.

Our view of the light which shines from the canon of which we have been speaking, accords with that which Grotius presents in his Annotations on the New Testatment. In his note on Matt. xix: 14, he mentions this canon as being specially worthy to be noted, and adds, "For, however diversely interpreters may explain, it is manifest that the question was therefore moved concerning the baptism of the pregnant, because the child might appear to be baptized at the same time with the mother, while the custom was not to baptize any, unless upon one's own choice and profession. "

In the same manner also the Greek commentators explain the principle on which the Council proceeded in their decision. One of these, Balsamo, in his Compendium of Canons, says, the child cannot be baptized, because it is not yet born, and has not the deliberate purpose of the profession connected with the divinely appointed baptism. † And another Zonaras, with equal clearness, expresses himself thus: The embryo needs baptism when it shall be able to have the dileberate purpose. ‡

In the year 325, at the council of Nice, Eusebius, the eccle-

^{*} Utcunque enim aliovorsum trahant interpretes, adparet, ideo de baptismo praegnantium motam quaestionem, quod videretur cum matre simul proles baptizari, quae tamen baptizari non soleret, nisi super propria voluntate ac professione. Vol. I., p. 385, ed. 1755.

[†] Οὐ δύναται φωτισθηναι διὰ τὸ μηκέτι εἰς φῶς ἐλθεῖν, μηδὲ προαίρεσιν ἔχειν τῆς ὁμολογίας τοῦ θείου βαπτὶσματος.

[‡] Τὸ ἔμβρυον χρήζει βαπτίσματος ὅτε προαιρεῖσθαι δυνήσαται.

siastical historian, prepared a document for the signature of the three hundred and eighteen bishops who were there, and read it in the presence of Constantine the Great, and of the whole Council. It is preserved in the Greek original, both by Socrates and by Theodoret, in their ecclesiastical histories; and in it Eusebius says, "As we have received from the bishops that were before us, both in the previous catechetical instruction, and also when we received the laver; as we have learned from the divine Scriptures, and as, in the presbytery itself, and also in the episcopate, we have believed and taught, so also now believing, we set forth our belief, and it is this: We believe," &c. *

Here the important fact is incidentally disclosed that, not only Eusebius himself, but also the other bishops assembled in that great council, had received instruction before they were baptized; and most of them, unquestionably, had been born of Christian parents.

About forty years after the close of the eighth century, the learned Walafrid Strabo, at the request of Reginbert, wrote a book on the Beginnings and Additions in Ecclesiastical Affairs.† It is pronounced by Cardinal Bellarmine to be a useful work. ‡ It was printed at Cologne in 1568. It may be found also in the fifteenth volume of the great collection published at Lyons in 1677. § It consists of thirty-one chapters. The twenty-sixth treats of Baptism, and begins thus: "Concerning Baptism also some things are to be said. What was clearly prefigured in the passage of the Red Sea and of the Jordan, but more obscurely prefigured by many other figures, is here made known. This to those who were con-

^{*} Καθώς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ τῷ πρώτη κατηχήσει καὶ ὅτε καὶ τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν, &c. See Socrates, B. I, c. 8, and Theodoret B. I., c. 12. See also a fair and faithful translation by Dr. Cave, in his *Lives of the Fathers*, Vol. II., p. 112, Oxford, 1840; or in the Historical Essay, pre-i minary to the work entitled *Memorials of Baptist Martyrs*.

[†] De Extrdiis et Incrementis Rerum Ecclesiasticarum.

[‡] De Scrip. Eccles.

[§] Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum et antiquorum Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum.

verted to faith in the Messiah, was in the beginning of the new grace first shown by John to have been provided, not by his own invention, but by divine constitution; as he himself testifies, saying, He who sent me to baptize in water," &c. After some other remarks, the following statements are made:

"It is to be noted that in primitive times, the grace of baptism was accustomed to be given only to those who, in body and mind, had come to such maturity as to be able to know and understand what benefit is to be obtained in baptism, what is to be professed, and what to be believed, and, finally, what is to be preserved by the new-born in Christ. Indeed the venerable Father Augustine, in the book of his confessions, relates concerning himself, that he continued a catechumen almost to the age of twenty-five years, with the intention that, through this delay, he, instructed distinctly on each subject, might be led to choose freely for himself, and the ardent passions of the slippery age cooling off, he might be better able to preserve what was to be obtained in baptism.

"But, diligence in the divine religion increasing,—the lovers of Christian dogmatics understanding that the original sin of Adam holds liable to punishment, not only those who by their own deeds have increased the transgression, but even those who are without any deeds of their own (because, according to the Psalmist, they are conceived and born in iniquities, they cannot be free from sin, while they proceed from a corrupt root; so that deservedly concerning all it is said by the apostle, 'all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God,' and concerning Adam, 'In whom all have sinned)'; This, therefore, the followers of the sound faith perceiving [took care] that the little ones be baptized for the remission of sins, lest they perish, if they die without the remedy of the grace of regeneration. Not, as certain heretics, opposing the grace of God, contended, that children are baptized by no necessity, because they have not yet sinned. If this were true, either they were not be baptized, or if they were baptized unnecessarily, then imperfect and not true in them was the sacrament of baptism, which, in the creed, we confess to be given for the remission of sins. Therefore, because all whom the grace of God does not liberate, perish in original sin, children are necessarily baptized, even those who have not added to it by their own evil deeds. Which also Saint Augustine shows in his book on the Baptism of Children, and the African Councils and innumerable documents of other Fathers testify."*

These paragraphs need no comment. They come from a source which cannot be suspected of any partiality in our favor; and yet it will be perceived at once that they confirm the representations which we have made. They come from a zealous supporter of infant baptism; and yet they affirm, as an unquestionable historical fact, in the presence of catholic christendom, that, in the primitive times, infants were not baptized, and, of course, that for infant baptism there could have been no genuine tradition from the apostles. They come from a staunch friend of Augustine; and yet they show that his strong language, seeming to assert the universality of infant baptism, must be received with some abatement; for they incidentally present evidence from his own pen, that even he himself was not baptized in his infancy, although, it is well known, his mother was distinguished for her Christian piety and her deep solicitude for his spiritual welfare. That a large abatement of this kind must be made, appears also from other statements of Augustine himself, to say nothing of evidence independent of these. In his fourteenth sermon on the Words of the Apostles, he speaks of its being a common thing to inquire respecting a Christian's child, Is he a catechumen or a believer? That is, is he still receiving preparatory instruction, or has he been baptized as a believer? To say that it was common to have occasion to make such an inquiry is equivalent to saying that it was common for children to be instructed before being baptized.

The reduction of the practice of baptizing instructed child-

^{*}Notandum quod, primis temporibus, illis solummodo baptismi gratiam dari solitam qui et corporis et mentis integritate jam ad hoc pervenerant, ut scire et intelligere possunt quid emolumenti in baptismo consequendum, quid confidendum atque credendum, quid postremo renatis in Christo esset servandum. &c.

ren to the practice of baptizing children too young to be instructed, or to answer for themselves was gradual. It was facilitated in various ways, and urged on by imperative considerations; but still it had obstacles to overcome. Augustine still had occasion to answer some hard questions on the subject. Of these we present a single specimen. The established baptismal service, when applied to infants, seemed to some intelligent and conscientious persons to be inconsistent with the great principle of common veracity. This is brought distinctly to view in Augustine's reply to Boniface, a contem-

porary bishop.

"You seem to yourself," he says, "to have proposed a most difficult question indeed, at the close of your inquiry. With the carefulness, manifestly, with which you are accustomed to be exceedingly on your guard against a falsehood,* you say, 'If I set before you an infant, and ask you whether, when he grows up, he will be a chaste man? or whether he will be a thief? your answer doubtless will be, I cannot tell; and, whether he in that infant age has any good or evil thought? You will say, I know not. Since, therefore, you dare not say anything either concerning his future behavior or his present thoughts, why is it that, when they are brought to baptism, their parents, as sponsors for them, answer and say that they do what that age can have no thoughts of; or, if they have, nobody knows what they are? For we ask those by whom they are brought, and say, Does he believe in God? concerning that age which has no knowledge whether there is a God or not. They answer, He does believe; and in like manner answers are made to all the rest; so that I wonder how the parents do in those matters answer so confidently for the child, that he does this or that good thing which the baptizer demands at the time of his baptism; and yet, if at the same time I ask, Will this baptized person prove chaste? or, not prove a thief? I question whether any dare so answer, He will, or will not be such or such a one, as they answer without hesitation, He does believe in God, and he does turn

^{*} Difficillimam sane quaestionem tibi proposuisse visus es in extremo inquisitionis tuae: ea videlicet intentione qua soles vehementer cavere mendacium.

to God.' Then at the close you add, 'I entreat you to give me a short answer to these questions, in such a manner as that you do not urge to me the prescription of the customariness of the thing, but give me the reason of it.'

"When I had read your letter over and over, and had considered it as far as my short time would allow, it made me call to mind my friend Nebridius, who being a very diligent and sagacious inquirer into matters that were obscure, especially such as concern religion, could not endure a short answer to a weighty question, and took it very ill if any one desired such a thing; and would with an angry voice and look reprimand him, if he were a person that might be so used, as counting him unfit to ask such questions, who did not consider how much might and ought to be said on so great a matter. But I am not angry with you, as he was accustomed to be; for you are a bishop occupied with many cares, as I also am; so that neither have you the leisure to read a long discourse, nor I to write one; for he being then a young man, that would not be answered in brief to such things, made many inquiries in conversation with me, and inquired as one at leisure from one that was so too; but you, considering now your own circumstances that ask, and mine that am asked, bid me answer briefly about so great a matter; and this I here do as well as I can. The Lord assist me that I may be able to satisfy your demand.

"We often express ourselves so, that when Good Friday is nigh, we say, To-morrow, or, The day after to-morrow is our Lord's passion; though it is a great many years ago that He suffered, and his passion was never performed but once. So, on the Lord's Day we say, This day our Lord arose; though since he arose it is so many years. Why is there nobody so silly as to say we lie when we speak so, but for this reason; because we give names to those days, from the representation which they make to us of those on which the things were indeed done; so that that is called the very day which is not the very day, but answers to it in the revolution of time; and that which is not done on that day, but was done a long time ago, is spoken of as done

on that day, because the sacrament of it is then celebrated. Was not Christ in his own person offered up once for all? And yet in the sacrament he is offered up, not only every Easter, but every day; nor does he lie, who, being asked, says He is offered up. For sacraments could not be sacraments if they had not a resemblance of those things of which they are the sacraments; and from this resemblance they commonly have the names of the things themselves.

"As therefore the sacrament of Christ's body is after a certain fashion Christ's body; and the sacrament of Christ's blood is Christ's blood, so the sacrament of faith is faith. But to believe is nothing else than to have faith. And so when it is responded that an infant believes, who has not yet the faculty of faith, it is responded that he has faith on account of the sacrament of faith; and that he turns to God, on account of the sacrament of conversion; because the response also itself pertains to the celebration of the sacrament. So the apostle on this same subject of baptism says, 'We are buried together with Christ by baptism into death.' He does not say, We signify a burial; but he uses the word itself, We are buried; so that he calls the sacrament of so great a thing by the name of the thing itself.

"And so an infant, though he be not yet constituted a believer (fidelis) by that faith which consists in the will of believers, yet he is by the sacrament of that faith; for, as he is said to believe, so he is called a believer; not from his having the thing itself in his mind, but from his receiving the sacrament of it. And when a person begins to have a sense of these things, he does not repeat that sacrament, but understands the force of it, and by consent of will squares himself to the true meaning of it; and till he can do this, the sacrament will avail to his preservation against all contrary powers, and so far it will avail that if he depart this life before the use of reason, he will by this Christian remedy of the sacrament itself (the charity of the church recommending him) be made free from that condemnation which by one man entered into the world. He that does not believe this, and thinks it cannot be done, is actually an infidel, though he has the sacrament of faith; and that infant is much better who, though he has not faith in his mind, yet puts no bar of a contrary mind against it, and so receives the sacrament to his soul's health.

"I have given such an answer to your questions as, I suppose is, to ignorant and contentious people, not enough; and to understanding and quiet people perhaps more than enough. Nor have I, to spare my pains, urged to you the custom's being so firmly established; but I have, as well as I could, explained to you the reason of that most beneficial custom."

The ingenious sophistry of this reply, it is probable, will be more manifest to most of our readers than it was to Augustine himself. Indeed he may not have perceived it at all. But they will readily perceive that if the sacrament of faith constitutes the child a believer, then, to ask, Does this child believe? is to ask, Has this child received the sacrament of faith? while this is the very thing which he, not having received, is now brought for the purpose of obtaining. The question is asked, and must be satisfactorily answered, before the baptism, the sacrament of faith, can be administered. The only way to conceal the absurd and absolute preposterousness of asking the question, is to acknowledge duplicity in making the response, that is, to suppose that in the question, believing means one thing, and that in the response, it means another!

The manner in which Augustine denounces as an infidel every one in the church who was not convinced of the propriety of the dominant practice commended by him, is very striking. We allude to the following passage near the close of the reply: "He that does not believe this [what was affirmed to be accomplished in connection with infant baptism] is actually an infidel, though he has the sacrament of faith." From this severe rebuke, as well as from other evidence, it appears that there were such persons who, in his estimation, needed to be rebuked; and, in pronouncing sentence on these, a friendly warning might be given indirectly

to the prudence of his friend Boniface, the bishop to whom he was writing. That there were such persons in the church appears also, and still more clearly, from a parallel passage in his work on the Deserts and Remission of Sins and the Baptism of Children. There, referring to our Saviour's words in John iii:19, he asks, Whence does he say, 'Light is come into the world,' unless he says it concerning his advent, without the sacrament of which advent how are children said to be in the light? Or how do not those persons have even this in the love of darkness, who, as they themselves do not believe [but are actually infidels], so neither think that their children are to be baptized, when they fear for them the death of the body?*

It is painful and humiliating to think of the errors into which even good and great men are liable to fall; and it is instructive to see how they sometimes unconsciously deceive themselves and others. Here the mild and monitory words of Neander may be called to mind with benefit to us all. They are worthy of perpetual remembrance. "Augustine," he remarks, "assumed as that on which faith must fix,-every thing given in the tradition of the church; hence he was led to admit many foreign elements; and his well exercised, speculative and dialectic intellect made it easy for him to find reasons for everything. His system of faith wanted that historical and critical direction, whereby alone, returning back, at all periods of time, to the pure and original fountain of Christianity, it could make and preserve itself free from foreign elements which continually threaten to mix in with the current of impure temporal tradition." +

^{*} De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione et de Baptismo Parvulorum, Lib. I., cap. XXXIII. (61.) Works, Tom. X., p. 35. Ben. ed. Unde, Lux venit in mundum, nisi de suo dicit adventu, sine cujus adventus sacramento quomodo parvuli esse dicuntur in luce? Aut quomodo non et hoc in dilectione tenebrarum habent, qui quemadmodum ipsi non credunt, sic nec baptizandos suos parvulos arbitrantur, quando eis mortem corporis timent?

[†] Hist. of Christ. Rel. and Church, Vol. II, p. 359.

DR. BUSHNELL'S ARGUMENTS FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

VI.

INFANT BAPTISM AND INFANT COMMUNION.

We now request our readers to weigh carefully and candidly the evidence which has been laid before them. The question to be decided is one of no trivial import. Is Infant Baptism a divine institute, established by our Lord? or is it an unauthorized device of men? Was it known and sanctioned in the days of the apostles, or was it introduced afterwards? Is it a part of pure and primitive Christianity, or is it a corruption, a departure from the simplicity that is in Christ, an expedient resorted to under the overpowering influence of erroneous impressions in regard to the efficacy of the baptismal act, and in regard to its necessity in order to any one's being admitted into heaven?

Similar questions might be asked also concerning Infant Communion, which came into use along with Infant Baptism.

From time immemorial, a participation in the Lord's Supper had been regarded as one of the privileges of the baptized. Infant Communion made its first appearance where Infant Baptism first appeared, namely, in the African churches, and the first mention of it occurs in the writings of Cyprian, the zealous and powerful advocate for the baptism of endangered children in their earliest infancy, about the middle of the third century. In his collection of testimonies addressed to Quirinus,* he teaches the necessity of being baptized, from John iii: 5; "Except a man be born again, of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and the necessity of partaking of the Lord's Supper, from John vi: 53; "Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you."

In his Treatise on the Lapsed, he sets forth the guilt of those who had voluntarily participated in the heathen sacri-

^{*} B. III., c. 25 and c. 26.

fices, and says (c. 7): "Many, however, were unsatisfied with doing destruction upon themselves; men were urged to their ruin by mutual encouragements, and the fatal cup of death was offered from mouth to mouth. That nothing might be wanting to their load of guilt, even infants in their parents' arms, carried or led, were deprived while yet tender of what was granted them in the commencement of life.* Will not these children in the day of judgment say, We did no sin; it was not our will to hasten from the bread and, cup of the Lord to an unhallowed pollution. We perish through unfaithfulness not our own; and our parents on earth have robbed us of the parentage in heaven; they forfeited for us the Church as a Mother, and God as a Father; and thus while young and unaware, and ignorant of that grievous act, we are included in a league of sin by others, and perish through their deceit."

In c. 16, he makes the following statement: "Listen to an event that took place in my own presence, and on my own testimony. Some parents who made their escape, in the thoughtlessness of terror left behind them at nurse an infant daughter, whom the nurse finding in her hands gave over to the magistrates. Unable through its tender years to eat flesh, they gave it, before an idol to which the crowd assembled, bread mingled with some wine, which, however, was remains of that which had been used in the soul-slaughter of perishing Christians. The mother afterwards got back her child, but the infant was unable to express and make known the act that had been committed, as she had before been to understand or prevent it. Through ignorance, therefore, it arose, that when we were sacrificing the mother brought it in with her. The child, however, mixed with the holy congregation, could not bear our prayers and worship; it was at one moment convulsed with weeping, then became tossed like a wave by throbs of feeling, and the babe's soul, yet in the tender days, confessed a consciousness of what had happened with what

^{*} Infantes quoque parentum manibus, vel impositi vel attracti, amiserunt provuli quod in primo statim nativitatis exordio fuerant consecuti.

signs it could, as if forced to do so by a torturer. When, however, after the solemnities were complete, the Deacon began to offer the cup to those who were there, and in the course of their receiving, its turn came, the little child turned its face away, under the instinct of God's majesty, compressed its lips in resistance, and refused the cup. The Deacon, howevet, persevered, and forced upon her, against her will, of the sacrament of the cup. There followed a sobbing and vomiting. The eucharist was not able to remain in a body and mouth that had been polluted. The draught, which had been consecrated in the blood of the Lord, made its way from a body which had been desecrated. So great is the power of the Lord, so great the majesty. The secrets of the darkness are laid open under his sight, and God's priest could not be deceived in crimes however hidden. Thus much concerning an infant which had not the age to make known a crime which was committed on her by the act of others."

After these singular disclosures, we need not be surprised at the unequivocal statement of the highest authority in ecclesiastical history, that, "as the Church of North Africa was the first to bring prominently into notice the necessity of infant baptism, so in connection with this they introduced also the communion of infants."*

Ages passed away; and, sonetimes in a single age great changes occur. Ages passed away, and, in the meantime, the various influences and pressing considerations which had introduced infant baptism and infant communion, continued to extend and confirm these practices more and more.

After the lapse of nearly two hundred years, Augustine, in one of his works,† says: "Let us hear the Lord, speaking, not indeed concerning the sacrament of the laver, but concerning the sacrament of his holy table, to which no one, unless baptized, rightly approaches: Unless ye eat my flesh,

^{*} De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione, et de Baptismo Parvulorum. Lib. I. cap. xx: 26 and 27. Works, Tom. x: col 15. Ben. ed.

[†] Neander's Hist. of the Christ. Rel. and Church, translated by Torrey. Vol. I., p. 333.

and drink my blood, ye shall not have life in you.* Why do we enquire further? What can be replied to this? . . . Will any one dare to say that this sentence does not pertain to children, and that they can have life in themselves without partaking of his body and blood: because he does not say, 'He that has not eaten,' as concerning baptism, 'He that is not born again:' but says, 'If ye shall not eat,' as addressing those who were able to hear and understand, which, undoubtedly, little children are not able to do."

In a sermon he remarks: "Infants they are, but they receive his sacraments; infants they are, but they are made partakers of his table."† In the work first quoted, he also says: "Most excellently the Carthaginian Christians call baptism itself nothing else than salvation, and the sacrament of the body of Christ nothing else than life. Whence is this, unless from ancient, as I think, and apostolic tradition, by which the churches of Christ hold, as a fixed fact, that without baptism and participation of the Lord's table, no one of mankind can come either to the kingdom of God or to salvation and eternal life? ‡

And in one of his epistles he expresses himself in the following decisive manner: "No one who remembers that he is a Christian of the catholic faith, denies, or doubts, that children unbaptized and not having partaken of the Lord's body and blood, have not life in themselves, and thus are exposed to eternal punishment." §

^{*} John vi : 53

[†]Serm. 174. De Verbis Apostoli, I. Tim. 1. Works, Tom. V., col. 834.

[†] Optime Punici Christiani baptismum ipsum nihil aliud quam salutem et sacramentum corporis Christi, nihil aliud quam vitam vocant. Unde, nisi ex antiqua, ut existimo, et apostolica traditione, qua ecclesiae Christi insitum tenent, praeter baptismum et participationem mensae Dominicae, non solum ad regnum Dei, sed nec ad salutem et vitam aeternam posse quemquam hominum pervenire? See Lib I., cap. xxiv, 34. Works, Tom, x., col. 19. Ben. ed.

[§] Epist. 106. Nullus qui meminit Catholicae fidei Christianum negat aut dubitat parvulos, nec recepta gratia regenerationis in Christo, sine cibo carnis ejus et sanguinis potu, non habere in se vitam, ac per hoc poenae sempiternae obnoxios.

Innocent, Bishop of Rome in the time of Augustine, maintained the necessity of infant communion from John vi: 53.* Gelasius, also Bishop of Rome about a century later, did the same. †

About the same time—the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the sixth—the author of the Greek works ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite (mentioned in Acts xvii: 34), speaks of infant communion together with infant baptism, as an established usage.‡ He was supposed to have been ordained Bishop of Athens by the Apostle Paul; and his writings had very great influence. They were translated into Latin; and from the ninth century they were widely circulated in the Latin or Roman Catholic Church. At length, however, about the middle of the fifteenth century, their spuriousness was detected by Laurentius Valla.§

Near the close of the sixth century (590-604) the Pope St. Gregory the Great, in his book of Sacraments, treating of the baptism of infants, says: "Who are not prohibited from nursing before the sacred communion, if it be necessary."

In the seventh century, the Council of Toledo (Concilium Toletanum XI.), A. D. 675, excused from ecclesiastical censure those by whom the bread in the eucharist was rejected through extreme sickness or in infancy, when they knew not what they did.

A few years before the close of the eighth century (A. D. 790), the Emperor Charlemagne speaks of infants washed with the water of baptism, and satiated with the food of the Lord's body and the drinking of his blood. In his Laws, it is ordered that the Presbyter always have the eucharist prepared, so that when any one sickens, or a child is weak, he may administer the sacrament to him immediately, lest he die without the communion.

^{*} In literis ad Patres Synodi Milevitanae.

[†] In Epistola ad Episcopos per Picenum.

De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia, c. VII.

[§] See Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History, Vol. II., p. 80,

[|] Lib. II. De Imaginibus, c. 27.

[¶] Collected by Ansegisus, Lib. I., c. 161.

The Ordo Romanus, composed in the ninth century, gives the following direction: "Concerning children care is to be taken, lest, after they shall have been baptized, they receive any food or nurse, without the greatest necessity, before they partake of the sacrament of Christ's body."

Paschasius Raddert, a little before the middle of the ninth century, wrote an extensive work on the Lord's Supper. In this work, with a startling boldness, he expounded and defended the doctrine of transubstantiation; and, at the same time, he maintained that baptized infants, even if they should die before participating in the holy supper, would be saved in consequence of their union with Christ by baptism. Controversy ensued, and it was continued for ages. The opinion that in the eucharist the bread is changed into the body and the wine into the blood of our Lord, prevailed more and more, especially after the Council at Rome in 1079.

William De Champeaux, Bishop of Chalons, an intimate friend of St. Bernard, taught, as Bossuet expresses it, 'that he who receives one kind alone receives Jesus Christ entire.'*

Hugo à St. Victor, at Paris, who died about the year 1141, maintained that in the eucharist wine alone might be given to infants, because under each kind, whether bread or wine, the body and blood of Christ is at the same time received. + He pursued a middle course in respect to the necessity of infant communion. For, regarding the custom of the ancient church, he taught that the eucharist was indeed to be given to children, under the form of wine; but with caution and limitation. For, if in preserving the blood of Christ, or in administering it to children, there is danger [of accident to the sacred element], the observance should rather be omitted. Then he says that there is to the children no peril of salvation, if they should depart without the communion, because they are already made members of Christ by baptism. franc, Archbishop of Canterbury, taught the same. Hugo, in his work on the Sacraments, adds with respect to infants, The sacrament in the form of blood is to be administered

^{*} Que qui reçoit une seule espece, reçoit Jesus Christ tout entier.

[†] See J. Bona, Rerum Liturgicarum, Lib. II., c. 18. § 1. p. 723.

Vol. xxxiii. -38.

by the finger of the priest, because such are naturally able to suck."*

Paschal II., who was Pope from 1099 to 1118, wrote an epistle (32) to Pontius, Abbot of Clugny, in which he orders that children, and the feeble who cannot absorb the bread, may communicate in the blood alone, deeming this more becoming than to permit a dipped communion.† He commanded to give the two symbols separately, except to those who were extremely sick and to little infants, whom he permitted to communicate with the wine. After his time, this continued to be the usage of the Western or Romish Church, in regard to infants, so long as infant communion was practised. ‡

In the twelfth century, Odo, Bishop of Paris, who was alive in 1175, commanded his Presbyters not to give the elements to children in any manner. Thus in the Gallican Church, the custom of communicating the little ones ceased in the twelfth century; a custom which Hugo à Victor, a writer of the same century, wished to restore, yet affirms to have ceased, in his time, though some vestiges of it still remained. In some Roman Catholic countries vestiges of it remained long after his time.

^{*} De Sacramentis et Ceremoniis Ecclesiasticis, Lib. i. c. 20. Idem sacramentum in specie sanguinis est ministrandum digito sacerdotis, quia tales naturaliter sugere possunt.

[†] See J. Bona, Rerum Liturgicarum, Lib. II., c. 18., § 3., 719. Ut parvuli et infirmi, qui panem absorbere non possunt, in solo sanguine communicent, hoc decentius existimans quam intinctam communionem permittere.

[†] Paschal's Epistle entire is inserted by Baronius, in his Ecclesiastical Annals, in connection with the year 1118. n. 3. See it also in J. Schilterus, De Libertate Ecclesiarum Germanicarum, Lib. iv., c. 5, § 3.

[§] See his Synodal Statutes, c. 39.

For ample evidence of this, see Zornii Historia Eucharistiae Infantum, ex Antiquitatibus Ecclesiarum tum Occidentalium tum Orientalium secundum decem Saeculorum seriem et multiplicem varietatem illustrata,—printed at Berlin, in 1736; a work to which we are indebted for its lucid presentation of many important facts.

In the sixteenth century, when the great Lutheran Reformation occurred, and there was earnest inquiry on many religious subjects, the Romish Church, at the Council of Trent, decreed 'that children are not obligated to the sacramental communion,' as follows:

"Session 21st (the 5th under the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IV.), July 16, 1852."

"Doctrine concerning communion under each kind, and of children."

"The holy ecumenical and general council at Trent, in the Holy Spirit legitimately assembled, the same legates of the Apostolic See presiding, since concerning the tremendous and most holy sacrament of the eucharist, in divers places, by the arts of the most wicked demon, various monsters of errors are circulated, on account of which in some provinces many seem to have departed from the faith of the Catholic Church and from obedience, has resolved that those things which pertain to communion under each kind, and of children, be in this place expounded. Wherefore it interdicts to all the faithful of Christ, and forbids that hereafter they dare either to believe or to teach or to preach, otherwise than is in these decrees set forth and defined."

"Can. IV.—That children are not obligated to Sacramental Communion.

"Finally, the same holy council teaches that children wanting the use of reason are by no necessity obligated to the sacramental communion of the eucharist; if regenerated by the laver of baptism and incorporated in Christ, they cannot in that age lose the already obtained grace of the sons of God. Yet neither is antiquity therefore to be condemned, if in some places it has sometimes observed this custom. For as those most holy fathers have had, according to the state of that time, probable cause for what they did, so, certainly, it is to be believed, without controversy, that they did it by no necessity of salvation."

Appended to this canon is the following:

"If any one shall say that the communion of the eucharist is necessary to children before they come to years of discretion, let him be anathema."*

In the catechism of the Council of Trent, published by command of Pope Pius V., an octavo volume of more than five hundred pages, these remarks are made, namely: "The Council of Lateram [in 1215] decreed that all the faithful should communicate, at least once a year, at Easter, and that the omission should be chastised by exclusion from the society of the faithful. But although this law, sanctioned, as it is, by the authority of God, and of his church, regards all the faithful, the pastor, however, will teach that it does not extend to persons who have not arrived at the years of discretion, because they are incapable of discerning the Holy Eucharist from common food, and cannot bring with them to this Sacra-

*See p. 109-111, Canones et decreta Concilii Tridentini, ex editione Romana A. D. 1834, Leipsic, 1853. Sessio xxi. quae est quinta sub Pio IV. Pont. Max. celebrata die xvi. mensis Julii, MDLXII.

Doctrina de communione sub utroque specie et parvulorum.

Sacrosancta oecumenica et generalis Tridentina synodus in Spiritu Sancto legitimo congregata, praesidentibus in ea eisdem apopstolicae sedis legatis, quum de tremendo et sanctissimo eucharistiae sacramento varia diversis in locis errorum monstra nequissimi daemonis artibus circumferentur, ob quae in nonnullis provinciis multi a catholicae ecclesiae fide atque obedientia videantur discessisse, censuit ea, quae ad communionem sub utraque specie et parvulorum pertinent, hoc loco exponenda esse. Quapropter cunctis Christi fidelibus interdicit, ne posthac de iis aliter vel credere, vel docere vel praedicare audeant, quam est his decretis explicatum atque definitum.

CAN. IV. Parvulos non obligari ad communionem sacramentalem.

Denique eadem sancta synodus docet parvulos usu rationis carentes nulla obligari necessitate ad sacramentalem eucharistiae communionem, siquidem per baptismi lavacrum regenerati et Christo incorporati adeptam jam filiorum Dei gratiam in illa aetate amittere non possunt. Neque ideo tamen damnanda est antiquitas, si eum morem in quibusdam locis aliquando servavit. Ut enim sanctissimi illi Patres sui facti probabilem causam pro illius temporis ratione habuerunt, ita certe eos nulla salutis necessitate id fecisse sine controversia credendum'est.

Appended to Can. iv. Si quis dixerit, parvulis, antequam ad annos discretionis pervenerint, necessariam esse eucharistiae communionem: anathema sit.

ment, the piety and devotion which it demands. To extend the precept to them would appear inconsistent with the institution of this sacrament by our Lord: 'Take,' says He, 'and eat;' words which cannot apply to infants, who are evidently incapable of taking and eating. In some places, it is true, an ancient practice prevailed of giving the Holy Eucharist even to infants; but, for the reasons already assigned, and for other reasons most consonant to Christian piety, this practice has been long discontinued, by authority of the same church.*

Among the "other reasons" alluded to, the following might be mentioned: 1. Because infant communion has no firm foundation in the word of God. 2. Because, especially, it is not required in John vi: 53, but the declaration of Christ there made concerning the spiritual reception of himself by faith, had been misinterpreted and badly distorted from the genuine sense to the reception of the sacrament. 3. Because it is not necessary in order to obtain salvation. 4. Because it is an unreasonable service, and a needless stumbling block to our natural sense of propriety. 5. Because in being forced upon infants it is liable to be the occasion of hurtful and scandalous accidents to the body and blood of Christ, and thus dishonor Him, and bring reproach on the holy ordinance. 6. Because infants cannot examine themselves, and, discerning the Lord's body, partake of it in remembrance of Him, according to I. Cor. xi: 24-29.

The Oriental churches still adhere to infant communion. Fourteen or fifteen years ago, the Pope, Pius IX., by an encyclical or circular letter, in the modern Greek language, exhorted them to return to the Roman Church. Among the replies which this document called forth from the Greek Church, one of the ablest, that of Alexander de Stourdza, of Edessa, has recently been translated into English and published in the *Christian Review*. The author observes: "Our Lord, the High Priest and spottess victim, said expressly to his disciples, as He presented to them the cup of the new testament, 'drink ye all of it.' Now since the sacrament of

^{*}P. 227. The Catechism is translated into English by the Rev. J. Donovan, Professor, &c., of the Royal College, at Maynooth.

the body and blood of Jesus Christ was instituted for a perpetual observance, even 'until He come,' and since our Saviour has said, 'except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,' the Eastern Church, faithful to primitive example, has never dared to withhold the cup from the laity, nor even from infants of tender age. She ordains, moreover, that the bread shall be drenched in the consecrated wine."* . . Alluding to the decree of the Council of Trent, he adds: "The churches of the west have condemned an immense majority of the human race to die before they have tasted of the bread of life! They may accumulate the most specious arguments in favor of this practice; but these arguments will never be able to stand before the right and simple faith, before the authority of the universal church of all times. Let them beware! By reasoning in this way they will by little come at last to allow only the baptism of adults."

Here we pause. From the point of observation at which we have arrived, let us look around and survey some of the singular sights which have been disclosed as successive generations of men have appeared, and have passed rapidly away.

In the dim distance of far more than a thousand years, stand St. Cyprian and St. Augustine, affirming the necessity of infant communion, and proving it from the words of our Saviour in John vi: 53, "Except ye eat the body of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." Other bishops, yes, bishops of Rome, too, and bishops of the distant East, echo the same. It is recognized by ecclesiastical mandates, and by imperial laws. At length, circumstances somewhat change. New thoughts are suggested. Discussions arise. New influences are felt. Considerations that had been overlooked are appreciated. The words of our Saviour, that had been misunderstood and wrongly applied, are correctly And motives pure, and, probably, motives interpreted. mixed with human frailty and error, combine, under the over ruling providence of God, to produce a most remarkable

^{*}In the Greek Church, the bread, sodden in the wine, is given to the communicant, from the cup, with a spoon. This fact is stated by the translator, the Rev. Dr. Arnold, who resided several years as a missionary at Athens.

result. What St. Cyprian and St. Augustine had affirmed on this subject was condemned and anathematized! condemned and anathematized by a general council! condemned and anathematized by the general council at Trent, with the sanction of him who claimed to be the universal Bishop, the Vicar and Vicegerent of Jesus Christ on earth, and with the practical concurrence of all the Protestant Churches!

Henceforth let no man despair of other changes in the right direction. But how shall the great ecclesiastical controversies be rightly terminated? The Greek and other eastern churches do not acknowledge the authority of the Romish and other Western churches. But the word of the Lord endureth forever. While both the great anti-Protestant portions of christendom assail each other, and urge their antagonistic claims to apostolic tradition and primitive usage, let us, thankful to God for the unerring rule of faith and practice which he has given us, endeavor to understand and obey it, and set an attractive example by yielding joyfully the lovely fruits of obedience.

The same arguments, for the most part, that disprove and forbid infant communion, disprove and forbid infant baptism. And if infant communion is a great error, infant baptism is a still greater error, and more pernicious. Infant communion does not deprive the child of the benefits of communion when he arrives at the age of discretion. But infant baptism, performed in his early infancy, does, so far as it is regarded, prevent his ever receiving the benefit of being baptized upon a deliberate profession of his faith, an event which he ought to be able to remember, amidst the temptations and cares of life, till he descends into his grave with the well-assured hope of a glorious resurrection.

Infant baptism not only thus wrongs the child, and takes from him what belongs to him, and was designed for his use when he becomes a believer; but it wrongs our Lord himself. It actually, though not intentionally, sets aside his authority. It prevents an ordinance which he saw fit to appoint, and applies it to those to whom it is not adapted, and to whom he did not intend to have it applied. It tends, in effect, to annul what he ordained. He instituted baptism for professing dis-

ciples only. The apostles sanctioned no other. The Bible not only gives no support to infant baptism, but it has passages which clearly show that infants were not baptized in the time of the apostles. And the earliest ecclesiastical history after the time of the apostles knows nothing of the practice. It is a practice that originated in error; in a sad misunderstanding of John iii: 5, and other passages; in confounding the sign with the thing signified; in attributing a mysterious efficacy to the act of baptism; and in a commendable parental affection, misguided, and mingled with the surrounding superstition. It came as an angel of light, to perform a work of mercy. But, angel of light as it seemed to be, it has done an immensity of evil. Alas! what multitudes have been deceived with the vain confidence of being regenerate, and made heirs of eternal life, by an external act performed on them in a state of unconsciousness, or have been led to think that, in connection with such an act, their salvation has, somehow, been secured!

No beautiful association of parental duties and parental confidence in God, unutterably important as these are in their places; no ingenious fiction of a presumptive faith, strong and precious as the agencies and influences of faithful and judicious parents are upon their children; no plausible apology whatever can justify the virtual annulling of the initiatory ordinance which our Lord, in his wisdom and love, established for the observance of his disciples.

Infant baptism led to infant communion. Infant communion, the comparatively innocent accomplice, has been convicted and condemned. Shall the principal offender be permitted to escape condemnation? Why should this seeming angel of light still be caressed and lauded? Why should theological or metaphysical, or any pretentious theories, be constructed to keep up a lamentable influence, ill-gotten at first, and too long retained. No good reason can be given. Infant baptism has been proved to be, not an ordinance instituted by our Lord, or authorized by his apostles, or known to their earliest successors, but a human device, at a later period,—the offspring of misapprehension and of ill-directed kindness, relying on the supposed saving

efficacy of a religious ceremony. Whatever may be said of past ages, the present can have no valid excuse for continuing to maintain the error which we are deploring. The present state of christendom is summoning us to conflicts and to trials of our faith, in which we have special need of being established and built up, not in error, but in the truth. How else can we satisfy our own consciences? How else can we meet successfully the Romanists and the Greeks, with their misleading traditions, or rescue from infidelity the sceptics, stumbling over our inconsistencies?

The sacraments, baptism and the Lord's supper, have in themselves no efficacy; but the recipient, in order to be benefited by them, must receive them with faith in Christ. This, one of the great principles for which we have always contended, has now come to be generally conceded by persons of evangelical views in other communions. "But," as it has been said, with an alarming truthfulness, "until infant baptism be openly abandoned, there is a constant tendency to re-action, a danger of relapse. The entering wedge for the recurrence of all that is most fatal in the delusions of Popery is in the crevice, and a few hard blows may at any moment split all other Protestantism to pieces. It is not, therefore, merely in regard to the time and circumstances of a ceremony that Baptists are contending, but it is for principles the most valuable of any embodied in the Reformation from Popery, or in the whole range of evangelical piety-principles for which the Baptist denomination alone have consistently and unwaveringly contended during the last hundred years-principles now regarded with favor by evangelical Christians of other denominations, but in great danger of being weakened and disregarded. So long as infant baptism is preached, a Newman, or a Pusey, or a Nevin, or a Schaff, can, without much torturing, convert it into an acknowledgment of baptismal regeneration on the one side, and a Stoddard or a Bushnell make it the entering wedge of a lax church-membership on the other."*

^{*}See the excellent work, by the Rev. Prof. Curtis, of the University at Lewisburg, Pa., on The Progress of Baptist Principles in the last hundred vears, p. 73-85 (Chap. IV).

DR. BUSHNELL'S ARGUMENTS FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

VII.

INFANT BAPTISM AND INFANT CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

When the apostle Paul, in his epistle to Titus, mentions, among the qualifications that would indicate the suitableness of a man for the office of a bishop, his being "the husband of one wife," and his "having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly," he probably did not intend to be understood as saying that no man could be a bishop who was not a husband, or who had not children, or whose children were not all believers; but rather that his being a husband worthily exemplifying marriage as it was at first divinely instituted, and his having children so judiciously brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord that some or all of them were already baptized believers, would be incumbrances highly favorable to his being selected. We cannot, therefore, perceive the necessity of thinking with Dr. Bushnell, that the children here are called faithful or believers "in a presumptive or merely anticipatory way;" or that the Ephesian and Collossian children are included by the apostle among the faithful brethren of the two cities in the same way. The interpretation given of Eph. vi: 1, seems to us forced and unsatisfactory. On these words (children, obey your parents in the Lord), our author remarks: "It is not children in the Lord, or children obey in the Lord your parents; but it is, obey them who are parents in the Lord; as if their parentage itself, in the flesh, were a parentage also in the spirit, communicating both a personal and a christian life. So also," he adds, "when the parents are required to give a nurture in the Lord, we may see that the children are expected to be grown as saints and faithfuls, and to be presumptively in the Lord, apart from any expectations and processes of adult conversion." We cannot help thinking that if he had no particular theory to maintain, he would himself be satisfied with the short and simple note on this passage, in the Tract

Society's edition of the Bible: "Obey your parents: it is to be understood here, as in chap. v: 24, that the obedience enjoined extends to all things not contrary to Christ's commands; for the addition, in the Lord, that is, obey those who are in the Lord, or make his will the law of their being, excludes obedience to those commands which are contrary to Christ's word."

Be this as it may, Dr. Bushnell proceeds thus: "And it was out of such uses that the term faithful grew into the peculiar kind of church use in which it denotes all the supposed members of the Christian body, whether adults or only baptized children. . . . The very language supposes a membership in the church, or among the faithful brethren, by virtue of baptism, and mere christian nurture; such as on the footing of strict individualism, held by our Baptist brethren, could never even be thought of."

But has he proved that in the passages in Titus, Ephesians and Collossians, the very language supposes such a membership in the church, or among the faithful brethren, by virtue of infant baptism and mere christian nurture, as on the footing of the individualism held by the Baptists, could never even be thought of? His comment and paraphrase are unsatisfactory; and we cannot admit that the language, in those passages, supposes what he infers and affirms.

The well authenticated and simple fact is, that the term faithful grew into its peculiar kind of church use from the corresponding Latin and Greek words (fidelis and πιστός. In John xx: 27, our Saviour says to Thomas, "Be not incredulous, but believing.* Here in the Latin Vulgate, fidelis is the translation of the Greek word (πιστὸς) corresponding to the English believing or having faith, faithful. So it is in Titus i: 6, having faithful children; Ephesians i: 1, to the faithful in Christ Jesus; and in Coloss. i: 2, to the saints and faithful brethren. Chrysostom, in one of his Homilies, explains the use of the Greek word: Thou art called a faithful, a believer, because thou believest God.† In the earliest ages

^{*} Noli esse incredulus, sed fidelis. Μὴ γίνου ἀπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός.

[†] Πιστὸς διὰ τοῦτο καλῆ, ὅτι πιστεύεις τ $\vec{\phi}$ Θε $\vec{\phi}$. Hom, XXI. ad populum Antiochenum,

of Christianity, they who were baptized, were baptized upon a profession of their faith. They were decided believers. "The faithful, the believers (δι πιστοί), is the name which has uniformly been used to denote such as have been duly instructed in the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, and have been received, by baptism, into the communion of the Church. By this name they were distinguished on the one hand from infidels and heretics, and on the other from the catechumens," &c.* Even since the introduction of infant baptism, the name has been retained by the baptized. "And so" (as Augustine says in his sophistical letter to Boniface), "and so an infant, though he be not yet constituted a believer (fidelis) by that faith which consists in the will of believers, yet he is by the sacrament of that faith; for, as [in the preliminary part of the baptismal ceremony] he is said to believe, so he is called a believer."

After his expository introduction, Dr. Bushnell now proceeds to discuss the church membership of baptized children. He proposes to show the nature and kind of this membership; the reasons why it should exist; and the fact of its existence.

"The conception," he says, "of this membership is, that it is a potentially real one; that it stands, for the present, in the faith of the parents, and the promise which is to them and to their children, and that, on this ground they may well enough be accounted believers, just as they are accounted potentially men and women. Then as they come forward into maturity, it is to be assumed that they will come forward into faith, being grown in the nurture of faith, and will claim for themselves the membership into which they were before inserted." He finds a case analogous in the fact that our common law makes every infant a citizen. "What," he supposes it may be asked, "can the child do as a citizen? He cannot vote, nor bear arms; he does not even know what these things mean; and yet he is a citizen. In one view, he votes, bears arms, legislates, even in his cradle; for the potentiality is in him, and the State takes him up in her arms, as it were, to own him as

^{*}See the Antiquities of the Christian Church, translated and compiled from the works of Augusti and others, by the Rev. Lyman Coleman, p. 58.

her citizen. In a strongly related sense, it is, that the baptized child is a believer and a member of the church. There is no unreality in the position assigned him; for the futurition of God's promise is in him; and, by a kind of sublime anticipation, he is accepted in God's supernatural economy as a believer; even as the law accepts him, in the economy of society, to be a citizen."

But why "the baptized child?" Does the sacrament of faith make the infant a believer, either instantly or prospectively? Why does the church, the ecclesiastical community, restrict her spiritual care and kindness, and the blessings of the gospel to baptized children? The civil community, more godlike, extends care and kindness to all, without distinction. Where is Dr. Bushnell's authority for affirming that the futurition of God's promise is in the baptized child, any more than in one that has not been baptized, both being wisely brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? Let the promise referred to be distinctly pointed out. In what chapter and verse of the Holy Scriptures is it to be found?

Among the reasons why infant membership should exist, or be appointed, the following are mentioned:

"First of all, if there is really no place in the Church of God for infant children, then it must be said, and formally maintained, that there is none. And what could be worse in its effect on a child's feeling, than to find himself repelled from the brotherhood of God's elect, in that manner? What can the hapless creature think, either of himself or of God, when he is told that he is not old enough to be a Christian, or be owned by the Saviour as a disciple?"

We are happy in being able to assure Dr. Bushnell that we repel no child in this manner. We would welcome and encourage the little one's feeblest aspirations to become a loving and dutiful disciple of the Saviour. We would make a distinction, here overlooked, between the child that is a mere infant, and the child that is of sufficient maturity to participate, understandingly and with spiritual benefit, in the ordinances of Christianity, and to appreciate a union with the Church.

"Again," he remarks, "it would be most remarkable, if Christianity, organizing a fold of grace and love in the world and for it, had yet no place in the fold for children. It spreads its arms to say: 'For God so loved the world,' and yet it has no place, we are told, for children; children are out of the category of grace! Jesus himself was a child, and went through all the phases and conditions of childhood. . . . He said, too, 'Suffer little children;' but this was only his human feeling; he had no official relationship to such, and no particular grace for them! They are all outside the salvation fold, hardening there in the storm, till their choosing, refusing, desiring, sinning power is sufficiently unfolded to have a place assigned them within! Is this Christianity? In this view, it gives to little children the heritage only of Cain, requiring them to be driven out from the presence of the Lord, and grow up there among the outside crew of aliens and enemies. Let no one be surprised that, under such treatment, they stiffen into alienated, wrathful men, ripened for wickedness."

It is certainly surprising that Dr. Bushnell should think this to be a just representation of Christianity without the baptism and church membership of infants. Parental affection itself, united with wisdom, may deem the nursery a place more suitable for children than the Lyceum or Town Hall; and it may place them at a preparatory school, before it sends them to the University, or insists on their being admitted there.

In ancient times, persons won from heathenism, and children the offspring of christian parents, were carefully instructed before they were baptized. Even so late as in the time of Augustine, according to his own testimony, as we have seen, it was a common thing to inquire respecting a Christian's child, Is he a catechumen, or a believer? That is, is he still receiving preparatory instruction, or has he been baptized as a believer? And Eusebius, in his Evangelic Demonstration, speaking in a general way, as one might speak of a people under a pastor's care, or constituting a Christian congregation, says: There are three orders in each church or congregation; one, that of the leaders, and two,

those of persons under them; the people of the Church of Christ being divided into two orders, into that of believers, and into that of the persons not yet esteemed worthy of the regeneration by the laver,* that is (more briefly), the people being divided into two orders, the decided believers, and the not yet baptized. These last, who were not yet deemed suitable for baptism, doubtless, were, in various ways, receiving Christian nurture and instruction.

For such persons, according to the so-called Apostolic Constitutions, special prayer was offered "that God would teach them his commands and his ordinances, implant in them his saving and holy fear, open the ears of their hearts, strengthen them in piety, and unite them to, and number them with, his flock. . . O God, who through thy Christ didst appoint the disciples to be teachers, that men might learn piety; do Thou Thyself even now look down upon thy servants who are catechised in the gospel of thy Christ, and give them a new heart, and renew a right spirit in their inward parts, that they may both know and do thy will with full purpose of heart, and with a willing soul. Account them worthy of the holy initiation, and unite them to thy holy church, and make them partakers of the holy mysteries, through Christ our hope, who for them suffered death; through whom glory and worship be given to thee in the Holy Spirit, forever. Amen."+

Here are persons not immediately admitted to baptism and church membership; and yet, who will say that they were harshly repelled? And is it right to insinuate that the Baptist principle, in regard to baptism and church membership, "gives to little children the heritage only of Cain, requiring them to be driven out from the presence of the Lord, and grow up there among the outside crew of aliens and enemies?"

More than thirty years ago, the Baptist denomination in

^{*} Τρία καθ΄ ἐκάστην ἐκκλησίαν τάγματα, ἔν μὲν τὸ τῶν ἡγουμένων, δύο δὲ τὰ τῶν ὑποβέβηκότων, τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ λαοῦ εἰς δύο τάγματα διηρημένου, εἰς τε τὸ τῶν πιστῶν, καὶ τῶν μηδέπω τῆς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας ἠξιωμένων. Demonstrat. Evangel. Lib. vii., p. 200.

tBook VIII., Chap. VI.

this country published, at Philadelphia, a Tract entitled The Duty of giving Christian Instruction to Children.* "This duty," it states, "is, in the first place, the dictate of reason and affection. Reason requires that the ignorant be instructedand the more important the knowledge, the stronger is the argument for its being communicated. And the greater our affection for the persons needing instruction the more intense is our desire to have them instructed. Who does not pronounce it suitable that children be taught those things which may be useful to them in the present life? and who that loves his children does not desire to have them taught? Now, we take it for granted, that the knowlede of the Christian religion is more valuable than the knowledge of any other subject; for it fills the mind with the brightest conceptions of purity and benevolence; and it is connected with what has the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. It is, then, most manifestly, and most emphatically, the dictate of reason and affection, that Christian instruction be given to children. Besides, this duty is clearly implied in the general direction to make the Gospel known. In the command of our Saviour: Preach the Gospel to every creature, it is clear that he would have Christian instruction given to all who are capable of being instructed. The common sense of every man understands the direction as having reference to moral agents only, and to all moral agents belonging to the human family. The gospel is to be preached to all; and we are to encourage its ministers to go forth and instruct the most distant nations. Surely, then, our own children are not to be neglected; but so soon as they can understand, they are to be taught the simple and affecting story of our redemption, the first principles of the oracles of God. But further, the duty of giving Christian instruction to children is expressly enjoined. The Sacred Scriptures exhibit this duty in the most direct and positive manner: 'Provoke not your children to wrath,' says an apostle, 'but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.' Nurture is the more general term, indicating the

^{*}Number 124 in the catalogue of the American Baptist Publication Society.

education or training up of children, which, we know, comprehends instruction and example, rewards and punishments, and whatever may be necessary in this work. Admonition, as here used, directs our attention particularly to the mind of the child, as that with which we have especially to do; and we are here taught that this nurture and admonition, or instilling into the mind, must be conformable to the spirit and instructions of our Lord. So clear and prominent is the duty. It is the manifest dictate of reason and affection; it is implied in the general direction to make the gospel known; and it is expressly enjoined. It rests, therefore, on an immovable foundation; and we need no other."

Views like these, we think, indicate something better than "giving to little children the heritage only of Cain."

Dr. Bushnell asks, "Where is the encroachment when Christian parents baptize their child into the same discipleship with themselves, and set it in the school of Christ?" We reply, that to baptize a babe is to encroach on our Lord's prerogative. It is, virtually, to derange what He arranged, to annul what He ordained, to change what He appointed as an act of selfconsecration, and profession of faith and obedience, into an act of consecrating another, and of promising that another believe and obey. In regard to the child, it is an encroachment on his right, when he becomes a disciple, of being consciously present, and participating in his own baptism, and of recalling it to mind afterwards, with spiritual benefit. Let the parents set their child in the school of Christ, according to their best ability and judgment; but who has authorized them to suppose that there is no place in that school for the little one, unless it be baptized?

Next, we are urged to consider "the remarkable and certainly painful fact that, in the view which excludes infant baptism and the discipleship of children, the conversion itself of a parent operates a kind of dissolution in the family state, than which nothing could be more unnatural. . . . God's effectual calling is no such unnatural grace; it will never call the parents away from the children, to be themselves included in the great family of salvation, and look out in their joy to see their children fenced away!"

Vol. xxxiii.-39

Here again we have "infant baptism and the discipleship of children" placed together, as if they were inseparable companions, and one could not exist without the other. Why is this? It does not accord with the facts that have fallen under our observation. We never knew a parent who, in consequence of being converted and uniting with a Baptist church, became indifferent to the spiritual welfare of his children. We do not believe that such a case was ever known. And we are confident that the eloquence here expended on "the gathering of human parents away from their young," might have been more worthily employed.

Dr. Bushnell now inquires, "What will justify, or will naturally produce a more sullen remissness of duty in parents, than the fact that, for the present, God has shut away, and is holding away their children, and that they are never to be disciples of the fold, till after they have been passed round into it, through long detours of estrangement and ripening guiltiness? If there is nothing better for them than to be converted just as heathens are, why should they, as parents, be greatly concerned for their own example, and the faithfulness of their training, when the conversion is to be everything, and will have power to remedy every defect? How refreshing the contrast, when the children, given to God in baptism, are accounted members of the Church with them, as being included in their faith, and having the seal of it upon them!"

Here infant baptism and infant church membership come as the grand remedy for tardiness of conversion among the children of Christians. Were there no better remedies than these, we should be overwhelmed with despondency. But we rejoice that without these, quite as well as with them, we may labor, and pray, and hope for early conversions. We may daily come to the Saviour, and in faith and love bring with us our children, to receive his blessing, to learn of Him, and to imbibe his spirit. Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it.* In this, as in every duty, we acknowledge our dependence on God for

^{*}Prov. xxii : 6.

success, and rejoice in the divine assurance that our heavenly Father is more disposed to 'give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him,' than we can be to give good gifts to our children.* Looking up to Him as the gracious being who works in us and in others 'both to will and to do of his good pleasure,'† we hear the heavenly voice, 'In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand; for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether both shall be alike good.'‡ And then we have the apostle's exhortation and assurance, 'Let us not be weary in well doing, for in due season we shall reap if we faint not.'§

Thus we have ample encouragement,—all that is suitable, and possible in the nature of the case. Leaving out the baptism and church membership of infants, therefore, we have remaining a just and edifying description of truly Christian parents, when it is said, "Their prayers, they understand, are to keep heaven open upon their house. Their aims are to be Christian. Their tastes and manners are to be flavored by the Christian hope in which they live. There is to be a quickening element in the atmosphere they make. They will set all things upon a Christian footing for their children's sake; and their children, growing up in such nurture of the Lord, will, how certainly, unfold what their nurture itself has quickened."

Dr. Bushnell mentions as another consideration in favor of his system, that "the church itself, having this infant membership in it, will unfold other aims and tempers, and exert a finer quality of power. It will not be a dry convention of simply grown up men and women. . . . The parents will learn from the children quite as much as they teach, and will do their teaching fitly, just because they learn. The Church prayers will have a certain paternity and maternity in them; and the children will feel the grace of these prayers warming always round them. . . . And the whole volume of religious life will be unfolded by taking into itself the whole volume of nature and family feeling."

In the ancient church, as seen in the work claiming to be the

^{*} Luke xi: 13. †Phil. ii: 13. ‡Eccl. xi 6. §Gal. vi: 19.

Apostolical Constitutions, appropriate prayers were offered for the infants and for the catechumens, that they might be prepared for baptism and church membership. And we do not see why the children might not feel the grace of those prayers warming around them, and, in this respect be as much benefited before as after their initiation. Besides, we fear that, in taking "the whole volume of nature and family feeling" into the church, more would be lost than gained by "the whole volume of religious life."

That the supposed infant membership is a real and true fact, Dr. Bushnell maintains "may be seen from the following proofs:

1. Those declarations of Scripture which assert or assume the fact. The Saviour commands, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven. . . . Nor," it is remarked, "is it any objection, as respects the children, that 'except a man be born again, he cannot be entered into this kingdom;' for, potentially at least, they are thus born again; and so are as fitly to be counted citizens of the kingdom, as they are to be citizens of the state.

. . And the great apostle to the Gentiles, in at least two of his epistles to Christian churches, addresses children, directly, as being included among the saints, and faithful in Christ Jesus."

2. The analogy of circumcision. "This," it is argued, "was given to be the seal of faith, and a church token, in that manner, of a godly seed. Baptism can certainly be the same with as little difficulty, or as little charge of absurdity. True, they were not all Israel that were of Israel; and so all may not be Israel that are baptized. Enough that God gives the possibility, in both cases, in giving the rite itself." But our readers will bear in mind that He appointed infant circumcision, not infant baptism; and that the design of circumcision was very different from the design of baptism as instituted by our Lord. Abraham received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe.* In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor

^{*}Rom. iv: 11.

uncircumsision, but faith which worketh by love.* Baptism was designed to express the faith and devotedness of the baptized. If a person is bereft of reason, if through the violence of a fever, or of some accident, he becomes unconscious, is he to be baptized in his unconsciousness? If he is, on what ground, and by what authority? If he is not, then an unconscious infant is not to be baptized. Would not the administration of baptism in such a case, and in the case of an unconscious infant, be a manifest departure from the original design of baptism? Without a divine command requiring it, we are unable to see how it could be justified.

In regard to children Dr. Bushnell adds: "They must either be taken into the church, or else they must be excluded till they are old enough to be admitted on the ground of a religious experience. There is no other alternative. If they are excluded, then it is taken for granted that they are to grow up as unbelievers and aliens, which is only their public consignment to evil." Taken for granted that they are to grow up as unbelievers and aliens! Not at all. The children are to be affectionately and carefully brought up by their parents in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; and their parents are to have the co-operation of the Pastor, and the Church, and the Sunday School, and of all who would win the young to the Saviour and to the blessings, here and hereafter, of becoming early his decided and faithful disciples.

The author proceeds: "If they are taken to be in the faith, presumptively, as in the nurture of their parents, and so accepted, then every kind encouragement is given to them, and every pledge of divine help is graciously given to their parents."

What pledge, we respectfully ask, what pledge of divine help is graciously given to the Pedobaptist parent that is withheld from the Baptist parent, on account merely of his conscientiously withholding baptism from his infant child?

We are next told that "God, on his part, gives no presumption, either to the parents or their child, that he is to be only a transgressor and alien; but he gives the seal of faith"

(Does he?) "as a pledge, to raise their expectation of what he will do for them, and to throw the blame of a godless child-hood and youth, if such there is to be, on themselves." Where, in all the Holy Scriptures, such a doctrine can be found, as the one here taught respecting the design of Christian baptism, we have been unable to discover.

3. The holiness of children, mentioned by the apostle Paul in I. Cor. vii: 14, is urged as an argument for their church membership.

4. "All the reasons I have given," says Dr. Bushnell, "for the observance of infant baptism, go to establish also the fact of infant membership in the Church. All this holds good, especially of that which discovers the origin of the rite in proselyte baptism."

Respecting the proofs under these two heads we do not deem it necessary here to make any remarks. We refer our readers to what we have already had occasion to present for their consideration.

Finally, in addition to the more direct evidences adduced for the church membership of baptized children, Dr. Bushnell urges "the opinions of the Church and her most qualified teachers, from the apostolic era downward."

"This whole view of infant membership," he remarks, "as it stood in the first three centuries of the Church history, appears to be well summed up, both as regards the facts and the reasons, in the following statement of Neander: 'It is the idea of infant baptism, that Christ, through the divine life which he imparted to, and revealed in, human nature, sanctified that germ from its earliest development. The child born in a Christian family was, when all things were as they should be, to have this advantage over others, that he did not come to Christianity out of heathenism or the sinful natural life, but from the first dawning of consciousness unfolded his powers under the imperceptible, preventing influences of a sanctifying, ennobling religion; that, with the earliest germinations of the natural self-conscious life, another divine principle of life, transforming the nature, should be brought nigh to him, ere yet the ungodly principle could come into full activity,

and the latter should, at once, find here its powerful counterpoise. In such a life, the new birth was not to constitute a new crisis beginning at some definable moment, but it was to begin imperceptibly, and so proceed through the whole life. Hence baptism, the visible sign of regeneration, was to be given to the child at the very outset: the child was to be consecrated to the Redeemer from the very beginning of its life."*

This remarkable paragraph was occasioned by the passage in which Irenæus speaks of all as being regenerated to God through Christ. That the impartial and venerable historian should seem to acquiesce in the common erroneous opinion of its having reference to baptism, may easily have arisen from the intensity with which, while he was reading Irenæus, his mind was attracted to other matters than the one embraced in that passage. "Regeneration and baptism," he says, "are in Irenæus intimately connected; and it is difficult to conceive how the term regeneration can be employed, in reference to this age [infancy], to denote anything else than baptism. Infant baptism, then, appears here as the medium through which the principle of sanctification, imparted by Christ to human nature from its earliest development, became appropriated to children." How much does this fall short of baptismal regeneration? He now takes up "the profound Christian idea" which he supposes to have been in the mind of Irenæus, and from it, in conjunction with evangelical, and perhaps with some mixed ideas in his own mind, he skilfully develops a plausible theory of infant baptism,—an apology for a practice, which, according to his own testimony, was not introduced till long after the time of the apostles.

Here begins Dr. Bushnell's quotation. Let us look at it again: "It is the idea of infant baptism, that Christ, through the divine life which he imparted to human nature, sanctified that germ from its earliest development. The child born in a Christian family was . . to be under the imperceptible, preventing influences of a sanctifying, ennobling religion. .

. . A divine principle of life, transforming the nature, was

^{*}Neander's Church History (Torrey's translation), Vol. I., pp. 311, 312.

to be brought nigh to him" (In baptism? or in Christian nurture? or in both?) "ere yet the ungodly principle could come into full activity. . . . The new birth was not to constitute a new crisis."

Obviously, however, the new birth must in reality be something new, though it begin, not at a definable moment, but imperceptibly, and so proceed through the whole life. When it became perceptible, and there was reasonable evidence of its existence, it would be proper and truthful to let it be indicated by an appropriate sign. "Hence" (on account of the imperceptibility of the beginning of the new birth) "baptism, the visible sign of regeneration, was to be given to the child at the very outset," says Neander, the accommodating theorist. When?! When the child gave evidence of being spiritually regenerated, says Neander, the conscientious historian. On the very same page on which the quoted paragraph begins, the historian states most explicitly, "We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution."

Shall we regard the historian, or the theorist? Shall we follow the Holy Scriptures, or the unauthorized devices of men?

To strengthen his argument, Dr. Bushnell next presents a statement from Cave's Primitive Christianity, illustrating the power of religion, as seen in the domestic life of families: "Gregory Nazianzen peculiarly commends his mother, that not only she herself was consecrated to God, and brought up under a pious education, but that she conveyed it down, as a necessary inheritance, to her children, and it seems her daughter Gorgonia was so well seasoned with these holy principles, that she religiously walked in the steps of so good a pattern; and not only reclaimed her husband, but educated her children and nephews in the ways of religion."*

What renders this statement peculiarly instructive and valuable, is, that the remarkably pious and exemplary parents of Gregory Nazianzen did not think it their duty to have their offspring baptized in infancy. It is well known that he

^{*}Primitive Christianity, pp. 173-174.

did not receive baptism till he came to years of discretion; and yet at the time of his birth his father was a minister of the gospel.

Calvin is introduced, making the adventurous assertions that "children are baptized into future repentance and faith; for, though these graces have not yet been formed in them, the seeds of both are nevertheless implanted in their hearts by the secret operations of the Spirit." And Baxter is brought forward, teaching the doctrine of infant baptism thus: "As children are made sinners and miserable by the parents, without any act of their own, so they are delivered out of it by the free grace of Christ, upon a condition performed by their parents."

In 1649, the Cambridge Platform limited church-membership to such as appeared to be renewed persons; while, throughout New England, except the Hartford and Providence Colonies, none who were not members of the church, were permitted to be voters in civil affairs. In 1662, all baptized persons who lived reputably and assented to the gospel, were allowed to be so far church members as to be voters in the Commonwealth, and to have their children baptized.

We pass over Cotton Mather's unfavorable opinion in regard to "the way of the Anabaptists," and his favorable opinion in regard to "keeping persons under those church dispensations wherein grace is given."

Religion declined. After a long period in which the churches fell into a state of debility, and "well nigh lost the idea of spiritual life," there came the Great Revival, in 1740 and subsequent years, under the ministrations of Whitefield, Edwards and others. This, in the circumstances of the people, was very naturally attended with some ill-regulated excitements and some defective or erroneous views. Speaking of the kind of religion favored and promoted by the friends of the revival, Dr. Bushnell says: "It has one great merit, and one great defect. The merit is that it displaced an era of dead formality, and brought the demand of a truly supernatural experience. The defect is, that it has cast a type of reli-

gious individualism, intense beyond any former example. It makes nothing of the family, and the church, and the organic powers God has constituted as vehicles of grace."

In this connection, and on this topic generally, we think that Dr. Bushnell's censure is so severe and indiscriminating as, in many cases, to become unjust. His description is a caricature. It cannot have reference to Baptists alone. Doubtless, it was designed quite as much for some others, as for them, and it may be beneficial to all.

A pupil of Edwards, Dr. Hopkins, in his system of Divinity, discusses largely the nature and design of infant baptism. And he is now introduced. "He goes even beyond the notion of a presumptive piety in the children baptized, and says, 'The church receive and look upon them as holy, and those who shall be saved. So they are as visibly holy, or as really holy, in their view, as their parents are.' He asserts an organic connection of character between parents and children, as effectual for good as for evil; nay, that they may as truly, and in the same sense, transmit holiness as they transmit existence; not, indeed, independently of God, but by virtue of a covenant divinely constituted. 'If God,' it is affirmed, 'has been pleased to make a constitution and appoint a way in the covenant of grace with man, by which pious parents may convey and communicate moral rectitude or holiness to their children, they, by using the appointed means, do it as really and effectually as they communicate existence to them. In this sense, therefore, they may convey and give holiness and salvation to their children." On another page Dr. Hopkins says: "Real holiness and salvation are secured to the children of believers, by the covenant into which the parents enter with God, as it respects their children, when they offer them in baptism." * And "Jesus Christ does, in this transaction, receive the child into the same visible standing and character with the parent, as a visible saint, or holy person, and orders the church to consider and look upon it in this light." +

This assertion, that our Lord takes part in the transaction

^{*} Vol. II., p. 291.

when an infant is baptized, assumes that infant baptism is one of his institutes. But we are constrained to believe that it was not instituted by Him; and that it has no support, either in the holy Scriptures or in the earliest ecclesiastical history. Its non-existence in the time of the apostles would prove the non-existence of infant church membership at that time; but baptism would naturally imply membership. And now, respecting the matter before us, what is the testimony of the most reliable works on Christian Antiquities? We refer our readers to the volume prepared by Professor Coleman. It can easily be procured. There (chap. xiv. sec. 3) they will find the following statement: "The general introduction of the rite of infant baptism has so far changed the regulations of the church concerning the qualifications of candidates, and their admission, that what was formerly the rule in this respect, has become the exception. The institutions of the church during the first five centuries, concerning the requisite preparations for baptism, and all the laws and rules that existed during that period, relating to the acceptance or rejection of candidates, necessarily fell into disuse when the baptism of infants began not only to be permitted, but enjoined as a duty; and almost universally observed. The old rule, which prescribed caution in the admission of candidates, and a careful preparation for the rite, was, after the sixth century, applicable, for the most part, only to Jewish heathen and other proselytes. The discipline which was formerly requisite preparatory to baptism, now followed this rite."

The statement here made is corroborated by Bunsen, a writer distinguished alike for his frankness and for his extraordinary erudition. In his work on Hippolytus and his Age (about the beginning of the third century), he says: "The Apostolic Church made the school the connecting link between herself and the world. The object of this education was admission into the free society and brotherhood of the Christian community. The church adhered rigidly to the principle, as constituting the true purport of the baptism ordained by Christ, that no one can be a member of the

communion of saints, but by his own free act and deed, his own solemn vow made in presence of the church. It was with this understanding that the candidate for baptism was immersed in water, and admitted as a brother, upon his confession of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. It understood baptism, therefore, in the exact sense of the First Epistle of St. Peter (iii: 21), not as being a mere bodily purification, but as a vow made to God with a good conscience, through faith in Jesus Christ. Justin Martyr calls baptism a dedication of ourselves to God. This vow was preceded by a confession of Christian faith, made in the face of the church, in which the catechumen expressed that faith in Christ, and in the sufficiency of the salvation offered by Him. It was a vow to live, for the time to come, to God and for his neighbor, not to the world and for self; a vow of faith in his becoming a child of God through the communion with his only begotten Son in the Holy Ghost; a vow of the most solemn kind, for life and for death. The keeping of this pledge was the condition of continuance in the church; its infringement entailed repentance or excommunication. All church discipline was based upon this voluntary pledge, and the responsibility thereby But how could such a vow be received without self-imposed. examination? How could such examination be passed without instruction and observation?

"As a general rule, the ancient church fixed three years for this preparation, supposing the candidate, whether heathen or Jew, to be competent to receive it. With Christian children the condition was the same, except that the term of probation was curtailed according to circumstances. Pedobaptism, in the more modern sense, meaning thereby baptism of new-born infants, with the vicarious promises of parents or other sponsors, was utterly unknown to the early church; not only down to the end of the second, but indeed to the middle of the third century. We shall show, in a subsequent page, how, towards the close of the second century, this practice originated in the baptism of children of a more advanced age.

"Hence we find in the christian school of that period, four

great acts, three of which were common both to the new converts and to christian children: previous examination of the Jewish or heathen candidates who presented themselves; instruction; examination immediately before immersion and the taking of the vow; and, lastly, that ceremony itself."*

Again we request our readers to ponder the considerations which have been presented. Are they not sufficient to show the groundlessness of Dr. Bushnell's arguments for infant baptism? Are they not sufficient to show that it was not instituted, either by our Lord or by his apostles? And if it was not divinely instituted and sanctioned, it is an unauthorized human device, a perversion, an intrusion, crowding out (however unintentionally) what our Lord and Saviour did institute. Has it not a natural and strong tendency to open the way for untimely and unsuitable membership and unchristian character in the church, and for other departures from the regulations established by the wise and gracious Founder of Christianity? Ought it not, then, to be discontinued?

Notwithstanding Dr. Bushnell's sincere and earnest rejection of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, as held under the priestly forms of Christianity, some of the consequences of that doctrine must, almost inevitably, adhere to his system. Infant baptism arose at first, in great measure, from that doctrine; and while it exists, there will be imminent danger of its cherishing an undue and dangerous reliance on a ceremony. While it exists, disguise and adorn it as we may, it is still an unauthorized intrusion; and the more we disguise and adorn it, the more are evil consequences to be dreaded. The honor of our Lord and the interests of religion, throughout christendom, require that infant baptism be discontinued. He, and He only, has a right to be obeyed in this matter. And for the churches and for all the individuals concerned, there is safety only in obedience to his rightful authority.

Let baptism, as it was instituted by Him, be restored. The way is open for Christian nurture in all its amplitude and all its blessedness. The parent's duty is made as clear and imperative as the most intelligible words can express a command.

^{*} Vol. II. p. 105, 2nd Ed.

The parent is directly responsible; and, at the same time, he is to seek and receive all needed help. It is an error, if any suppose that we welcome only late or explosive conversions. We would gladly accept the child, with the child's experience. We ask only for reasonable evidence that he cordially loves the Saviour, and, humbly relying on his grace, desires, with deliberate purpose, to serve and honor Him forever.

The American Baptist Publication Society, in the Tract which has already been mentioned as having been issued many years ago, gives the following representation: "That, in the time of our Lord there were children who had received the truth in the love of it, is evident from the twenty-first chapter of Matthew, where it is stated: 'When the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that He did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the Son of David, they were displeased, and said unto Him, Hearest thou what these say? And Jesus saith unto them Yea; have ye never read, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?' This is a quotation from the eighth Psalm; and, it being poetry, it is somewhat hyperbolical, according to the poetic manner; but the idea intended to be exhibited is perfectly manifest, namely, that God is pleased when young children feel his love, and utter his praise.

"Instances of early piety have occurred in almost every age of the world; and they are not rare in our own country at the present time. Within the circle of our own observation, and particularly in those places where special attention has been paid to the subject of religion, many a striking and lovely example of this kind has presented itself; and we have been most happily taught the force of the passage, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings, thou hast perfected praise. Indeed, there is abundant proof that genuine conversions may occur, and that they have occurred, at a very early period. Why, then, we ask again, why should we not hope, and labor, and pray for such a blessing in respect to our own children?"

Expressions like these ought to have protected our Denomi-

nation from Dr. Bushnell's unfavorable representations. It is not our Christian principles, but our failing to live up to them, that is to be censured. In our endeavors we will welcome help, from whatever quarter it may come, and in whatever form, whether of reproach or of commendation, of encouragement or of admonition. Let the righteous smite me; it shall be a kindness: and let him reprove me: it shall be an excellent oil.*

The volume before us contains much that is valuable. Besides the discourses or essays in which the arguments occur which we have been reviewing, there are eight or ten others. One of them is on "the ostrich nurture"; one is on "the out-populating power of the Christian stock"; and another is entitled, "when and where the nurture begins." The rest are on, parental qualifications; physical nurture to be a means of grace; the treatment that discourages piety; family government; plays and pastimes, holidays and Sundays; the Christian teaching of children; and family prayer. Without approving every sentiment expressed, we commend the perusal of the book to the discriminating reader. He will find it highly interesting and suggestive.

Would that the author might have health and a disposition to prepare an improved edition, thoroughly expurgated of the present errors, and thus furnish, on a subject of immense importance, a volume that might be a worthy companion for his recently published sermons, and for his thrice welcome chapter on the character of Christ.

C. - It has something managed of the

^{*} Psalms cxli : 5.

LAW IN RELATION TO MIRACLES.*

[BY JAMES M. HOYT, ESQ., OF CLEVELAND, O.]

Man is in one sense, of necessity, ever learning, and never coming to the knowledge of the truth. As a being of limited capacities, starting here with an unlimited expanse of truth around him, the unknown, while it ever invites him to exploration, ever widens in its outlines and recedes from his complete comprehension. Launched into existence here, his capacities, however noble in nature and destiny, and however rightly put in action, are yet in infancy. Personally, in his growth to manhood, as toward wide horizons of truth, he may so advance beyond the crude conceptions and experience of childhood as to cease to think as a child, and to speak as a child, and may put away childish things.

But as higher and outlying horizons, yet unsurveyed by his intelligence, unknown to his consciousness, he must, even in his sturdiest manhood in this life, in the view of beings of a higher intelligence, wear the badges of infancy. And this would be true, and must ever continue true, of man in relation to beings of an intelligence transcending his own, were every act of his capacities rightful and healthful in the conquest of truth, and every step onward one of unerring progress. All this is of necessity incidental to the expansion of powers ordained to increase through action—to be developed by

^{*} An Address before the Rhetorical Society of Rochester Theological Seminary, at its Anniversary in May, 1863. Published by request.

growth—to advance from stage to stage of stature by the acquisition and assimilation of truth.

The imperfections, however, of man's knowledge in the realms of truth open to his exploration here, are increased indefinitely by the imperfect action of his powers. These are often used perversely. The fruit of such action, instead of normal progress in acquiring truth, is abnormal deformity through the acceptance of false conceptions as true, and the use of delusive standards in exploring the unknown. Hence, error and delusion have come to be constant elements in man's advances into the unknown, which need constantly and carefully to be eliminated.

Fallacy has been so often accepted as reality in man's enterprises to enlarge the boundaries of his knowledge, that he is compelled, as the inexorable condition of true progress, to return constantly to demonstrable standards of truth; to test every essay into the unknown, and every fancied acquisition of possessions there, by the tried measures of an assured experience.

Man's use of his capacities has been so almost universally perverse—we glance only at its fact, not at its cause—his efforts to determine the unknown have been so often fruitless, so often presumptuous, so often reckless in judging of that beyond his experience by standards which only a puerile reason could deem adequate, that modesty and caution in his speculations, and distrust of the accuracy and healthfulness of his intellectual action, ought always to accompany his inquiries. I speak thus, because convinced that in nothing has man been guilty of greater presumption and puerility in reasoning, than in his treatment, to a great extent, of the subject which I invite you now to consider, namely—Law, in its relation to Miracles.

I would define law, as a mode of action. Some might prefer adding, that it is also a mode or condition of existence. But the latter statement is implied in the first, for there can be no action without the existence of all concerned in the action. Again: Some may deem it essential to state that law is not only a mode of action, but is also a mode of rela-

Vol. xxxiii-40.

tion. Here, too, while conceding that law is indeed a mode of relation, I deem the statement superfluous, because implied in the former. For, if law be a mode of action, then action according to a given mode, of necessity implies relation. True, we may conceive of relations according to fixed modes, which, within limited spheres, and for limited periods are unaccompanied by that form of action which shows itself in visible changes. But even there, when tested by broader relations, there is constantly an inherent though latent action of force or power tending to preserve the relation, and fix its identity and steadfastness amid opposing forces. It is the action, in fact, of a perfectly adjusted counterpoise of forces, the result of which is the harmony of apparent rest. But in reality, to a view reaching deeper than the surface, it will appear that each atom involved in the whole relation steadfastly stands sentinel at its post, bearing and resisting to the full limit of the force made to inhere in it in its relations. For instance, look at a tree, in a still atmosphere. It is an embodiment of relation, in all its parts at rest. The trunk, the branches, the attenuated spray, the foliage, are all, apparently, at rest. But really each is acting with inherent force to maintain the steadfastness of the whole, each atom acting in the trunk and branches by cohesion against gravity-acting in modes which elude our senses; but which make the integrity of the relation constant. So that while that tree in all its parts is the fruit of law as a mode of relation, this result itself is the fruit of law as a mode of action.

Beyond its relations to the material, the statement that law is a mode of action, appears equally true in relation to the mental and spiritual. As to any law of the understanding, any law of the heart, any spiritual law, having its field of development in the realm of the soul, it will not be doubted that every such law, within its sphere, is a mode of action. Even considered in the abstract, as for instance, a mathematical law, determining the relations of quantity or space—it may be urged, that we can conceive of such a law, only as it is associated in the conception with real relations to quantity or space, made overt to our consciousness in the discernment

of the relation as mentally applied. I do not confound here the act of the mind in conceiving the law, as determining that the law is a mode of action; but urge that we do not conceive of the law, however abstract, except by conceiving of the relation implied in the law in action, as applied to quantity or space.

Not pausing to pursue this inquiry further, I return to law in its relations to the material world, as more immediately involved in our subject. I venture to assume, then, in the present discussion, that law, considered as an ultimate generalization, is defined with sufficient precision and comprehensiveness as a mode of action.

Any action, seen constantly to be in accordance with a fixed mode, suggests some force or power back of the action, predetermining the mode. The mind, when it discerns a law, intuitively assumes that there is some force or cause which is the source of the law. We live in a universe of action; action so constant, so multiform, so universal, that we conceive of existence and action as inseparable.

The action, also, is so uniformly in accordance with determined modes, that our consciousness perpetually testifies that we live in a universe of law. Law, inhering in every atom, uttered by every voice of nature, written all over the earth and the heavens.

In such a universe of law, a soul must be sunk below intelligence, or be so perverted as to thwart its intuitions, if it does not seek for a Lawgiver.

Again: The modes of action which come to our knowledge, though wondrously varied, the more closely we study them, appear the more clearly to be the best possible to effect the results which flow from them.

These modes, too, in relation to the results, are seen to be never accidental, but to be determined by a selection, which reveals, the more fully we comprehend it, the more perfect wisdom. By as much as we grow in our intelligent apprehension of the realities to which we are related in our existence; by as much as the horizon of human knowledge, amid the countless forces in action around us, expands in discerning

design, adaptation, unerring selection in the choice of forces specially commissioned to ensure special and constant effects, by so much does the mind, through an irresistible intuition, accept as a necessary reality, underlying, predetermining, overruling, energizing all law, a Supreme Intelligence; an intelligence radiating into man's soul, as a discerning centre, from an infinite circumference.

I beg leave here, as fully corroborating my rendering of the truth, to repeat to you the language of Agassiz, who, in his "Contributions to the Natural History of the United States of America," thus speaks: "All organized beings exhibit in themselves all those categories of structure and of existence upon which a natural system may be founded, in such a manner that, in tracing it, the human mind is only translating into human language the Divine thoughts expressed, in nature, in living realities. The combination in time and space of all these thoughtful conceptions, exhibits not, only thought, it shows also premeditation, power, wisdom greatness, prescience, omniscience, providence. In one word, all these facts in their natural connection proclaim aloud the one God, whom man may know, adore and love; and Natural History must in good time become the analysis of the thoughts of the Creator of the universe, as manifested in the animal and vegetable kingdoms."

I do not forget that there are minds so perverted and paralyzed in their intentions as to dream, in the stupor of an insane egoism, that in the universe, thought, intelligence flows from human minds as from divine springs in which every thought or intelligence is generated and given forth in consciousness. They ignore the fact that the power to think, the capacity and material for intelligence, are imparted to them, as created souls wondrously made in the image of the Omniscient; souls knowing little yet as they ought to know, but with capacities which rightly used will lift them to an ever increasing knowledge of the one eternal mind. Were it possible for an eye made luminous in the sunlight to dream that itself generates and projects into its sphere the sun, giving to it volume and splen-

dor—the folly, though superlative, would be infinitely less than for a soul to dream that a conscious God has no personal being in the universe but in its consciousness. Inspiration takes the form of the exactest and most ultimate mental science in declaring that souls so perverse and abortive in action, "have the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them because of the blindness of their heart."

But the aim in this discussion is not so much to consider theism as having an eternal and omnipresent habitation in the universe, as to seek to see God in action in his own infinite realm of law. With this view, I may assume as granted without dissent here, the being of the one living personal God—the eternal, all-knowing, all-mighty mind—the fountain of all intelligence in the universe—the author, sovereign and unity of all law; in whom we live and have our being; who created us in the image of his own intelligence, to the end that we might come to know him, and to enjoy him forever.

To return, then, to law in its relation to miracles. I would define a miracle as an attestation, through special divine action, of a divine revelation; of course in this statement we are considering miracles in their relation to religion. It is conceivable that there may be divine action which is truly miraculous, but which has no reference to any revelation to man. Such action, however, lies entirely without our present field. We are legitimately restricted now to what are commonly known as the biblical or christian miracles. Such a miracle I conceive to be, as before stated, an attestation, through special divine action, of a divine revelation.

To say that a miracle is a violation, or even a suspension of a law of nature, is gratuitously to vitiate the conception with constant elements of incongruity and error which destroy its unity. Such definition is neither specific nor comprehensive. For it is clearly conceivable that there might be special divine action attesting some divine revelation, which by fulfilling to the utmost every purpose which a miracle can effect is essentially a miracle, without any, even the least violation or suspension of any natural law; nay, it may be by and

through such law. As, for instance, the heavenly voice at the baptism of Jesus proclaiming in audible speech from the skies, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." was special divine action, to attest a divine revelation. he who says that there was a violation, or even a suspension of any natural law, makes an assertion so gratuitous as to bring upon himself the whole burden of its proof. Not that God, in the selection of means to specially attest his revelations to man, is shut up to the ordinary modes of action known as natural laws. He may use them, or he may use higher modes at his pleasure. Still less, that God has not, did He choose to put it forth, ample power to suspend and violate any natural law, for He who created can destroy. But these inquiries do not of necessity arise in the conception of a miracle. By a vicious definition to assume them to be of the essence of a miracle, is to fall into confusion of thought. The defence of a miracle thus defined is the defence of a fallacious statement of that which has had no existence. Attack on a miracle thus defined is attack on a phantom, not the reality. For instance: when Christ changed water into wine, and thus attested through special divine action God's sanction of his teaching as a revelation of his truth—to say that any natural law was suspended, or violated, is wholly gratuitous. water was made wine by a special exertion of divine power. The act was simply creative. I profess not the slightest ability to explain the process. To do so would require an intelligence nearly level with that of the Creator. But though the mode of God's acting there is inscrutable, as is the mode of myriad forms of his creative power in nature, it is still indisputably conceivable that the mode, though far above the ordinary level, was yet in the most absolute harmony with the whole plan of action which we call nature. There was no jar, no discord, but the utterance in nature and by nature of a loftier strain of harmony, which, while perfectly attuned to all her other voices, attested the immediate energy of her God. While we count as futile every attempt to give a rationale of the process by which the water was made wine, yet so far from nature being violated, it is clearly conceivable that He who ordained the process which we call natural, by which water in the grape is supplied with those elements which change it to wine, might through higher processes as strictly in harmony with nature as is the growth of the grape, cause the presence of those elements in the water through the instantaneous exertion of his power. To assume that time, that duration of effort, to effect a given end, is of the essence of divine action is gratuitous presumption. It is applying to the Infinite the limits necessary to the finite. He who by processes unfolded in time, can take elements from his exhaustless resources and combine them through the growth of the grape in wine, may derive and combine the same elements in wine instantly, by action of a higher nature, because less mediate, without the intervention of the grape. To assume the opposite, is to say simply that because God can make a given thing in one way, therefore He cannot make it in an ther way—a conclusion without proof, as imbecile as it is presumptuous.

All that is true of the miracle just cited, is equally true of all miracles justly interpreted. They are neither without law nor against law. Their sphere is in a higher plane of law, which, from the necessity inherent in the whole purpose of a miracle is, as related to human experience, extraordinary.

To make an apple on a tree, call it nature though you may, from bud to mature fruit, no man can prove, and therefore no man has any right to assume is not the product of Divine power. It is the visible result, familiar to our senses, of laws or modes of action harmoniously coalescing through wondrous processes which reveal a potential intelligence preconceiving, predetermining, and sustaining these modes of action in all their numberless and incessant relations antecedent and present. This is ordinary nature. The lesson man ought to learn from it is, that in ordinary nature God reigns and is not far from every one of us. Let some celestial being come down to us on the plane of our own nature, stoop to the level of our capacities that he may not transcend our conceptions, and speaking to us in our own language in modes of thought native to our souls tell us

of relations which in the future before us we bear in the plan of God, to realms of truth and life beyond and above our experience in this world,—relations which are spiritual, holy and heavenly, and which being eternally vital to our souls he came to make known to us, because, being beyond present experience they could not be learned by us in fulness through our knowledge of this world's economy; to prove that he was sent by God, and had brought down to us from God's higher realms truth that related us to life, peace and spiritual blessedness high as heaven above earth, let this teacher thus assuming to speak for God, by an instantaneous act of power, form and give to us within our sight, but by processes inscrutable to our perceptions, a perfect apple, which we could eat and identify as real, and the seeds of which we could test as genuine by their growth when planted; this would be a miracle. It would be an attestation through special divine action of a divine revelation. It would necessarily be above and beyond ordinary nature, else it could not be a miracle. pose and in mode it must be extraordinary, or cease to be miraculous. But in this there would be no suspension of law -no violation of nature. It would be but the God and author of nature giving us in our lower sphere a glance into a higher realm.

Still further: it can be urged that within its appropriate relations a miracle is not only not unnatural, but is just what true nature, widened to contact with these higher relations, inexorably demands. A miracle, in the appropriate antecedents and surroundings of a miracle, is not only not incredible, but it is instinct with the loftiest and most supreme credibility. A miracle in such relations is not only not contrary to human reason; it is in fact precisely what human reason in just action demands, and has a right to demand,—a right made native to its intuitions by the author of human reason. Should not He who made human reason with its understanding and its intuitions, and placed it in relations to himself in nature, to rise through action to conscious intelligence of the God of nature,—should He not, when revealing to man knowledge which of necessity is extraordinary in relation to man's natural

experience, attest that revelation as actually from himself, by some extraordinary and demonstrable proof of its divine authenticity, then would the Author of nature depart from and do violence to nature, by withholding just what nature would most imperatively demand to complement its own relations, and give fulness of harmony to its scope of action.

Bear in mind that this statement of the natural and just demands of human reason by no means makes it necessary that God should accompany every revelation of truth beyond man's present experience by a miracle. To do this would be itself a violation of reason, by destroying the very nature of a miracle; because the instant you make it ordinary, you take from it its specific characteristic and purpose. It is enough that the realm of truth lying above man's worldly experience, and which God by revelation would open to his soul, be once justly authenticated as real and divine, by miraculous attestations on a lofty plane of grandeur and scope in harmony with the altitude of the truth itself,—and then, demonstration of its divine origin once given, the demands of reason and nature thus fulfilled, faith becomes to the soul the natural and vital force which holds it in allegiance to the new-found power.

If a man denies that God is, in all the power and plenitude of his infinite attributes and relations, we have nothing to do with such a man in this discussion. His soul is yet bound within a shell of prejudice, conceit and error, become through morbid action so concrete as to incrust his intuitions, and shut them off from living contact with spiritual forces, which else would call them to higher life. That man, with the powers of his soul all latent and paralyzed, rises to the consciousness only of his lowest and most temporary relations to truth. He lives in God's universe, shut up in a shell which eclipses God to his soul. He needs a birth to higher life, which can be opened to him only by breaking the shell which imprisons his soul.

Let a man, however, be once penetrated by a vital faith that God is, and his whole soul will unite in the conviction that God must have externally and of necessity infinite realms of intelligence and power, of truth and life, which lie far above and beyond man in his present relations. If

God be accepted by the soul as the author of its intelligence, seeking ever to lift it to a higher consciousness of divine truth and love; that soul will deem a revelation of God to man as pre-eminently credible, rational and therefore in the most absolute sense natural, and will accept a special attestation by God of such revelation of himself, as complementing nature, as harmonizing with the intuitions of a rational intelligence—in short as revealing God in nature, the eternal unity of all his works. To such right reason—to a soul thus emancipated from delusion, and coming into the open day of God's light which illumines all his works, the incarnation—the stupendous fact in nature of Immanuel, or God with man—the veiling of the eternal Word—thus called because the expression, the making known of God's activities through Him by whom all things were, and are, and will be to eternity—I say the veiling of this Word in human form to bring God into present, conceivable, and in the true sense natural, relations with his creature man, that man may learn how to begin aright in becoming acquainted with God—this this in the whole range of creation—the whole history of nature and of man-is pre-eminently the most rational, the most gloriously natural event of all time. To a soul awakened to true life Jesus shines, and will ever shine, the sun of reason as well as the sun of righteousness.

Thus will such a soul begin to see the truth of that transcendent generalization of philosophy, as well as of inspiration, given to us through a prince of reasoners, as well as of apostles, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times (that is, the period when lower realms of nature shall rise to rounded harmony in higher), God will gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in Him.

A miracle is of necessity something beyond man's common experience. It is something from above, and of course it cannot lie in the plane of those modes of action, constituting natural law, with which man is familiar. The relation, too, of the miracle to these natural modes of action, must be inscrutable by our present powers. Could we

explain the relation, the whole purpose of the miracle would be thwarted, and in reference to its true end, it would be abortive. It is of the very essence of a miracle that it be so transcendently inscrutable in relation to any known and mediate modes of action, that the mind instinctively and instantly refers it to the primal spring of all power in the universe—God. Then, then only, it stands in nature, in philosophy, in reason and in verity, a miracle—a divine act in living and potential harmony with a divine purpose, and that purpose clearly within the nature of the Most High God.

To object, then, to a miracle as essentially incredible because extraordinary, is simply puerile. To test a miracle by seeking to reduce it to measurement and comprehension through the common standards of man's experience, is irrational.

What would you think of an astronomer who would triumphantly flourish a yard-stick as the infallible means of bridging the chasm, to man's consciousness measureless, between himself and Sirius? Let him go out on some clear night, in full view of the star in its quenchless glory, and declare that it is not except just so far as his yard-stick can gauge it. The star, notwithstanding, would still shine serenely in the lofty plane of its own natural relations.

To say that a miracle is in violation of human experience, in other words, in violation of ordinary nature, we have seen to be a merely gratuitous assertion, without an iota of proof. To say that a miracle is above and wholly beyond ordinary nature, is simply to say that it is a miracle. It is but to ascribe to it that which of necessity is of the essence of a miracle.

Let a man go to the puissant King of Dahomey, in his African realm, and converse with him of nature, as unfolded to each by their mutual experience. The King, born under a torrid sun, has no experience of or authenticated faith in any other climate. The other has the horizon of his knowledge of nature widened by travel and reliable testimony till it comprehends every zone. Let the latter inform the King that he had seen mighty rivers—the St. Lawrence, for instance—solid on the surface as stone, so that droves of

elephants could tramp on the face of the waters unyielding as rock. Suppose the King then to reply, "I have experience of the infallible uniformity of natural law. That experience demonstrates to the point of irresistible conviction, the inherent mobility of water. I have experience also of the fallibility of human testimony. Your testimony is directly contrary to my experience of natural law. Therefore, I am bound by logic and philosophy to reject your testimony, as essentially incredible."

This would prove the King to be an adept in the school of Hume. But would it prove that the St. Lawrence does not freeze?

Or, further: To bring into contrast the relative experience of the two minds, let the travelled stranger tell the King of snow.

Should His Majesty, planted on the same dogma of the inherent incredibility, and incompetency of all testimony to establish that which lies beyond and in apparent contrariety with human experience, reply deliberately: "Sir! I have experience of salt. I have experience that salt, as salt, is unchangeably salt; therefore, it is impossible that there can be such a thing as snow." A palpable non-sequitur! Sheer nonsense! you say, because there is no logical connection between the two. True, very true, but true only because two planes of experience wholly disconnected from each other are assumed as rationally united. One man may have experience of salt; another man may have experience of snow. But the experience of one proves nothing against or for the experience of the other. So one man may have experience of ordinary nature. Also, because providentially witnessing the attestation of a revelation, he may have convincing experience of a miracle; and may testify of both to another man who has had experience only of ordinary nature. If the latter urges his experience as proof that the former could not have had an experience beyond his own, it would be simply asserting that nothing is or can be, but that which he knows, and because he knows salt and not snow: therefore, because salt is salt, there cannot be snow. It would be palpable that such a

man should follow the guidance of some other apostle than Hume, if he ever came to know anything as he ought to know.

I have a neighbor, who is at the head of the telegraphic department of the Government. To facilitate his converse with the war office when he is at home, he has a wire led from one of the main lines to his chamber. A few days since in conversation with me he stated that he had been sitting in his room, and having through long use become so familiar with the click of the magnet that he translates it into language and understands it mentally as speech, he heard an operator in San Francisco conversing with an operator in New The two, thus in relation to the intelligible and nearly instantaneous communication of ideas, were brought face to face. Now, suppose my experience of the varied spheres of natural law had been limited as those of Hume in his day, and my faith in testimony no greater, and I had replied: "Sir! you are an honest man, I do not doubt. But, like all men, you are liable to delusion. I have experience of the infallible uniformity of natural law. I have abundant experience of the fallibility of human testimony. Your statement, though I may imagine you to believe it, is clearly to my view opposed to natural law, therefore, I am bound to reject it." Would my inexperience of mighty realms of natural law, prove anything in such a case but my own triumphant stolidity? The philosophers of the ebon school of Hume might have demonstrated in his day, by the inexorable sophistry of his dogma, the inherent incompetency of testimony to prove the existence of instantaneous converse between men across a continent, but the telegraph would have been a possible and natural reality notwithstanding.

The unchanging uniformity of natural law within the plane of our ordinary experience, proves nothing in reality one way or the other in relation to miracles, which belong to a plane extraordinary. Nay, the unchanging uniformity of natural law is but the necessary result of its derivation from an omniscient God. Assume in your conception that God is (and there can be nothing but abortive assumptions of any

thing except from the first cause as the point of departure); assume that God is almighty and all-knowing, and then it must follow that he who is the author of nature, the eternal spring of all the modes of action or laws in nature, would originally, because omniscient, have selected and ordained from among the numberless modes possible, the one which in view of all his purposes would be the best possible in its sphere? and having selected omnisciently, to depart afterward from uniformity, in the mode, would be for omniscience to defeat itself. Man is often so thoughtless as to infer from the unchanging uniformity of natural law, by virtue of which from its universality, there often arises destruction or disaster to single persons or things, to have avoided which would have required such special and perpetually recurring departures as to nullify the law-from this uniformity, I say, man infers a blind action in the law which he dissociates from intelligence.

Yet the fact is nevertheless eternally real, that precisely because the law was ordained and is sustained by the supreme intelligence—precisely because omniscience reigns in the mode and sphere, there can be no departure. Hence, the very uniformity of nature is proof that its modes and spheres are the expression of the almighty and infinite intelligence. God looks at the modes and spheres in relation to the whole scope of his purposes. Man sees them from an inch of time and territory. What to man seems disjointed and contradictory, God sees to inhere in an eternal unity.

We are brought here, had we time to dwell upon it, in full view of the great problem for created, and consequently finite souls—the question, what is law in its ultimate essence? Is it everywhere and alway the expression of the instant and ubiquitous presence and power of the Lawgiver, acting in the law? Or is it delegated, or deposited power, imparted primarily by the Almighty and Omniscient, and assigned, each mode or law to its allotted realm? I lay no claim to power to solve, this problem, insoluble in its fullest scope by the finite mind. The tendency, however, of mere physicists to gravitate toward the conception of natural law, as something which, though primarily born of God, is now in its mode and

sphere in no wise dependent upon his instant power and presence, thus practically enthroning a vague idea of law, and putting God afar off in his own universe, may well prompt us to a more spiritual acceptance in nature of the Supreme Intelligence, in whom we live and move and have our being, and by whom all things consist. While we accept gladly, as ever enlarging the horizon of our knowledge, the dicta as to modes and spheres of natural law, gathered by just scientific and inductive exploration of the varied fields of nature, we should beware lest we become "alienated from the life of God." We should take heed that in no realm of his creation, the Creator be eclipsed to our souls. I am content, or ought to be, with the intuition made native to right reason, that God, immediate or mediate, is the only solution of the problem of existence. Though He be inscrutable and ever past finding out, from an eternal necessity, yet it is just as necessary that if I am a creature He is creator. If He is not, I am not, and nothing is.

To a soul having its starting point within the universe of Him whose name is Holy and who inhabiteth eternity; to a soul enlarging to wider contact with truth through the successive acquisition of truths in detail, which must be assimilated to and built into its personal intelligence; to such a soul there must ever, at any stage of its expansion, lie beyond the open day of its then present consciousness, measureless realms of truth, which the Omniscient only can inhabit; and to which the finite soul must be related of necessity alone by faith; realms, in which truth seen first through faith, will constantly, in the ever widening outlines of the soul's spiritual sight, rise upon it from twilight into the clear consciousness of day.

For a created soul, at or near its birth, with little but its own being, wondrous though that be, and with the whole infinitude of truth yet unknown around it, to project itself from its inch of time and consciousness into the eternal, and come back from transient glimpses into the fathomless profound, with oracular deliverances to its fellow creatures of what God in the scope of his omniscience must be, and must do, and

cannot do; of what is of the divine essence, and what is not—is simply for infantile imbecility to assume to give law to the Almighty. Yet this is just what self-elected seers, known as such only in the diction of human folly, have assumed, and are assuming to do.

All along the track of a philosophy, falsely so called, there lie the wrecks of Babel towers which tongues of self-destroying jargon had sought to rear up to the Most High upon the great highways of truth. In the solemn march of providence, made luminous through inspiration, these towering systems as they rose, darkening counsel by words without knowledge, have been tumbled into ruins, with scarce one stone left upon another.

Had a nursing babe been placed beside Newton, when in the maturity of his majestic consciousness of the laws which he demonstrated in the Principia, could that babe have told Newton anything which was or was not real? We shall learn as much concerning God as Newton could have learned of the babe, if, discarding the relation of faith toward God, we deny that God is beyond what each instant we can see; and contemptuously ignoring the revelation by God of himself in his own spiritual modes through miracle and inspiration, we accept instead the dogmas of infantile presumption, and founder in our own imbecility, as we strive to see without light, and to know without knowledge.

It is a sign of growing manhood when the soul comes to see, that, related to its finite powers, there must as certainly be mysteries which will be eternally insoluble, as that there are clearly comprehended truths.

The soul shows not only manhood, but high healthfulness, when, like Arnold of Rugby, it can lie as serenely still in the presence of such mystery, as in the presence of such truth. All along the endless way from the infinite down to the finite, the voice of mysteries to present consciousness is calling the soul to rise by faith derived through revelation from the Holy Spirit to ever loftier heights, whence it can see grander realms. Eternity will not exhaust the exceeding weight of glory which will become thus the inheritance of the child of God in Christ.

We cannot be armed with a nobler maxim than that of old John Mason, who said nearly two hundred years ago, "Then does religion flourish in the soul when it knows how to naturalize spiritual things, and to spiritualize natural things."

We should study science, study nature, study law, for all is theology. All find their harmony in their eternal Source and Unity. Amid the works of God, wherever and whenever revealed to us, in nature and in grace, we should stand erect as the conscious children of our Father. Living toward Him in time and in eternity, the language of Heaven may be native to our hearts—"Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of Saints."

ARTICLE III.—THE MILTONIC DEITY.

BY J. W. STEARNS, WINONA, MIN.

There is one scene in Dante's Inferno which, for its simple grandeur, we have always loved to picture to ourselves Under the guidance of Virgil, the poet has entered that desolate region where the loss of all hope of change is the only and bitter punishment.

"We were not far

On this side from the summit, when I kenn'd
A flame, that o'er the darkened hemisphere
Prevailing shined. Yet we a little space
Were distant, not so far but I in part
Discovered that a tribe in honor high
That place possessed.
Meantime a voice I heard: 'Honor the bard
Sublime! his shade returns that left us late!'
No sooner ceased the sound, than I beheld
Four mighty spirits toward us bend their steps,
Of semblance neither sorrowful nor glad."
Vol. xxxiii.—41.

These were the spirits of Homer, Horace, Ovid and Lucan, who thus welcomed back the bard of Mantua.

"Lo! I beheld united the bright school Of him the monarch of sublimest song, That o'er the others like an eagle soars."

We are thrilled with pleasure as we thus do homage to those whom all ages have delighted to honor. A peculiar charm rests upon the works of these men, like that which lingers over old castle walls, and "spots of earth renowned in story," a subdued but impressive splendor reflected from the minds of those who have done homage there; and we feel that their works are nobler and grander than those of other men, because for ages they have not failed to awaken a responsive feeling of admiration in the hearts of intelligent readers. The estimation of more modern times would add Milton also to this illustrious group, and award to him the meed of immortality for verses which, like the mountain stream, flows with a perennial freshness. We therefore feel no fear that we touch upon a theme grown old and threadbare, when we venture to call attention once more to Paradise Lost.

In doing so it is our purpose to examine the poet's representation of the Deity; to develop some of the peculiarities of that representation, and their apparent causes; and to review, in part, the grounds of that opinion which we find advanced in Prof. Draper's History of the Intellectual Development of Europe: "Posterity will perhaps with truth assert that Paradise Lost has wrought more intellectual evil than even its base contemporaries, since it familiarized educated minds with images which, though in one sense sublime, in another are most unworthy, and has taught the public a dreadful materialization of the great and invisible God. A Manichean composition in reality, it was mistaken for a Christian poem." This strongly expressed opinion has perhaps startled many of the readers of the work, and it may not be uninteresting to inquire how far such a charge can be substantiated.

Milton himself was not unaware of the extraordinary difficulties attending his undertaking, nor must we overlook them. He has measured their height and depth in that sublime apostrophe to light which introduces the third book. He dealt entirely with things such as the eye of man hath not seen, and such as were at the same time the realities of a religion with which his piety forbade him to trifle. was thus forced to create actors from the slightest hints of Scripture, which, nevertheless, must conform perfectly with the spirit of Holy Writ. In this his task was more difficult than Dante's, though in many respects similar. to compare the two great Christian poets, the bard of Catholicism and the bard of Protestantism. The subjects of which they have treated are kindred, and, relating to the destinies of the race, are of universal interest. Both find their scenes for the most part in the spiritnal world, and their actors among the spirits. Milton has turned back to that event which "brought death into the world and all our woe." Dante has looked forward beyond the veil of this life to scan the awful mysteries of eternity. They are different, and vet alike: different in the means which they use to produce effects; alike in the results they attain. Both describe spirits alike: both leave similar impressions of unutterable misery and ineffable happiness. Yet are they widely different. There is no confusion amid the multitude of torments which Dante has detailed. Order reigns supreme; even in the realms of Pluto each has a place and a punishment assigned him according to the crimes he has committed. Milton's hell exhibits Moloch and Belial, Mammon and Beelzebub, demons each, but widely different, assembled with the promiscuous hosts of the fallen in one vast confused assembly. This picture, moreover, bursts upon us at once in all its sublimity, and the mind shrinks back from the effort of comprehending its grandeur and terrors. The vision of Dante slowly opens the dread sorrows of the bottomless pit: one by one they come before us, each awful almost beyond conception, yet each leaving us power still to contemplate and to wonder: the mind expands as the poet adds scene

after scene of hopless woe, and strains to grasp fully each new vision, till at last it sinks back overwhelmed and subdued. The impression produced by Dante is more terrible and more lasting: it is more terrible because the mind has been strained little by little to its utmost capacity, and then left to feel that the immensity of woe is still uncomprehended. Milton's vision looms up before us at once in all its horrors, and compels us to gaze in blank astonishment and dismay. The mind does not strive to measure the depth and extent of woe, for it sees at once that the abyss is too extensive and too terrible for its power; yet it does not feel that immensity and terror as if it had taxed all its strength in the effort and had failed. Dante's poem also makes a more lasting impression because it is more definite. Milton is a seer who points to the vision before his eyes, and describes its imposing outlines and gigantic proportions: Dante is the artist who portrays, one after another, in all their details, the sorrows of the abyss of woe. Milton's poem is grander as it is read; Dante's as it is contemplated. Milton's overpowers for the moment, but the effect cannot be recalled in its grandeur without the aid of the same great master; Dante's lingers long in the memory, as if the enchanter had thrown a spell over those who read. Whoever will compare the first and second books of Paradise Lost, and the eighth, ninth and tenth cantos of the Inferno, will feel the justice of these distinctions.

The same kind of inconsistency which Dr. Johnson has remarked in Milton's treatment of spirits may also be remarked in Dante's. They are sometimes pure spirit, and sometimes animated bodies. Dr. Johnson has instanced Satan's walking upon the burning marl, and sinking in the vacuity of space, as corporeal images. His assuming the form of a toad is like a spirit, but when he resumes his own form and takes a shield and spear again, he becomes a body. The same inconsistency may be remarked in the other inhabitants of Pandemonium. There are many circumstances that, in like manner, render ambiguous Dante's representations of the manner of existence in the regions of the Inferno. He is careful to inform us that the condemned

are spirits, but he puzzles us sadly as to what properties belong to spirits. He continually reminds us that they have not weight like himself; he conceives of them as immortal and unchanging; he grants them powers not given to mortals, as that of foreseeing events; beyond this we do not recognize any characteristics of spirits. Meantime the torments described are all bodily sufferings, burning in fierce flames, boiling in the lake of pitch, suffering laceration at the hands of demons, driven about by tempests, bitten by serpents, foul with diseases and sores. Some of these punishments illy comport with that very lightness of the spirits so often referred to, as that of the hypocrites, who pace slowly and wearily under the tremendous weight of armor, gilded without, but of solid lead. Virgil also performs some feats, reminding us forcibly of quick muscles and strong sinews. Pursued by the treacherous demons in the fifth gulf of the eighth circle, he snatches the trembling Dante in his arms, and, flying with the speed of wings to the entrance of the next gulf, he plunges boldly down its rugged descent to a place of safety: and again in making their exit from the sixth gulf, Virgil raises Dante in his arms from crag to crag, that he may catch hold and draw himself up; and Virgil himself, though light, could scarcely mount. These instances seem more like the feats of an athlete than the acts of a spirit.

It is worthy of remark that every description of hell which we have, even that in Holy Writ, represents the tortures and sufferings as those of the body. Whether this is because there is not sufficient variety in the kinds of mental suffering, or that the torments of the mind do not make so vivid and terrible an impression upon us when they are described, as do those of the body; or for some other and more recondite reason, we will not attempt to say. Moreover, so accustomed are we to the representation of angels and departed spirits in bodily form, and with human faculties, that these incongruities, in their poetical representation, do not affect us unpleasantly. We acknowledge them to be spirits, and yet see no striking inconsistency in attributing to them actions and properties peculiar to material bodies; and this, we think,

arises naturally from the teachings of Scripture. The angels who kept not their first estate are "reserved in everlasting chains" to the day of judgment. Jacob wrestled with an angel until the dawn, and the Patriarch's thigh was put out of joint by his antagonist; the one which appears to Balaam is a spirit, for the prophet does not see him in the way, yet when Balaam's eyes are opened he sees the form of the angel with a drawn sword in his hand. Thus we have the mingling together of the attributes of body and spirit as a difficulty from which this subject has never been cleared.

Milton, therefore, cannot be charged with materializing the spiritual world. The course which he has pursued, and the images of which he has made use, are sanctioned by inspiration, by poetical precedent, and by the inherent necessities of his theme. Indeed, it is impossible to conceive how the momentous subjects of Paradise Lost could have been developed with vividness and reality to our imaginations, without any intrusion of corporeal images and actions into the world of spirits. That he has accomplished this dangerous undertaking with so much delicacy and skill as to escape deeply wounding either our taste or our religious feelings, is due alike to the learning, the piety, and the art of the poet.

But all the difficulties attending the representation of spirits become tenfold greater when we attempt to represent the Deity. In this Dante has ventured further than Milton, and in the true spirit of Catholicism, has presented a vision of the Divine Trinity. While we are startled at the audacity of this attempt, and led to condemn it as in its very conception too material and unworthy, we are yet forced to admire the wondrous art of the poet. He has described almost nothing; he has told us the vision was one of ineffable glory, and that human language was inadequate to its description; he has shown us the form of nothing "in the heavens above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth." While we acknowledge the splendor of that description, and commend the delicacy of the poet which led him to appear overwhelmed by the awful grandeur of the vision, we yet feel that there is more true sublimity in the passage from the twenty-third of Exodus, where the Lord answers Moses' request to behold his glory: "Behold! there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock; and it shall come to pass while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by."

But the danger of attempting such a conversation as Milton has introduced in the Third Book of Paradise Lost is scarcely less, although the poet has Scriptural examples to follow. We may not be able to determine the thoughts or the words that are becoming to the Deity, yet we feel that there is a certain dignity and sublimity which is essential to all human representations of them. This dignity, we believe, is everywhere preserved in the Bible, notwithstanding that He is frequently represented as investigating, repenting and avenging, like men. He is likened not to common men, but to a supreme ruler, and something in the expression, or its accompanying circumstances, gives us a deep-felt impression of a power higher than man's, and a knowledge beyond his attainment. Like Jacob, we feel to tremble and say, "Surely the Lord is in this place and I knew it not."

It is not so in the classics, and especially in Homer. He. too, represents the Deity as a man, but that distance which properly separates between his ways and our ways is not preserved. He grants to Zeus the supreme power and control over the other divinities, and makes his decree the law of Olympus. But the ideal is lowered when he represents the "Father of the Gods" as overcome by the wiles of Juno; or attempting, like a kind and indulgent parent, to soothe the anger of Athene; or revealing his future plans that his quarrelsome subordinates may not be angry at his present course; or calling a council of the gods, and recounting in boastful language his own vast power, and then, to enforce obedience and submission to his will, adding a threat more becoming to a village schoolmaster than the ruler of Olympus. The God of the Old Testament is represented with the feelings and passions of a man, yet of one raised as far above all others in the dignity and justness of those passions as in the power which he possesses. The Zeus of Homer might have been one of the leaders of the Greeks, suddenly transported from the command of a disorderly army upon earth, to the control of a disorderly heaven upon Olympus.

We have always felt that the first part of the third book of Paradise Lost fell far below its subject. There is something in it which disappoints our high-wrought expectations. For this we think there are two principal reasons: first, because Milton has too closely followed his classic model. Of this our space will allow only a few illustrations, but a careful comparison might develop many others. Nothing save classic precedent can justify this expression,

"Thus while God spake, ambrosial fragrance filled All heaven."

which needs only the addition of nectar to complete the picture of Olympus. Again:

"And where the river of bliss through midst of heaven Rolls o'er Elysian flowers her amber stream."

Again, in Book V., we find both the food and drink of the Homeric Olympus transferred to heaven:

"Though in heaven the trees Of life ambrosial fruitage bear, and vines Yield nectar."

And the angels partake of this food at evening. We must be pardoned for one or two longer extracts, in which will be found a remarkable resemblance both in the form and in the substance of the speech:

"Hear all ye angels, progeny of light,
Thrones, dominations, princedoms, virtues, powers,
Hear my decree, which unrevoked shall stand:
This day I have begot whom I declare
My only son, and on this holy hill
Him have anointed whom ye now behold
At my right hand; your head I him appoint;
him who disobeys,
Me disobeys, breaks union; and that day
Cast out from God and blessed vision, falls

Into utter darkness, deep ingulph'd, his place Ordained without redemption, without end."

Bk. V., 600-615.

Gods! Goddesses! Inhabitants of heaven!
Attend; I make my secret purpose known.
Let neither God nor Goddess interpose
My counsel to rescind.
Whom I shall mark soever from the rest
Withdrawn that he may Greeks or Trojans aid,
Disgrace shall find him; shamefully chastised
He shall return to the Olympian heights,
Or I will hurl him deep into the gulfs
Of gloomy Tartarus, where hell shuts fast
Her iron gates, and spreads her brazen floor."

Cowper's Iliad, Bk. VIII., 5-17.

The Father, in his address to the Son in the third book, after describing Satan winging his way towards paradise to accomplish the fall of our first parents, and foretelling the success of his attempt, says of man:

"So will fall

He and his faithless progeny. Whose fault?
Whose but his own? Ingrate, he had of me
All he could have; I made him just and right,
Sufficient to have stood though free to fall;
Such I created all the ethereal powers
And spirits, both them who stood and them who failed;
Not free, what proof could they have given sincere
Of true allegiance, constant faith and love?"

Bk. III., 95-105.

In like manner Jove, discoursing to the immortals and recalling the slaying of Ægisthus by Orestes in revenge for the murder of his father, says:

"Alas, how prone are human kind to blame
The powers of heaven! From us, they say, proceed
The ills which they endure: yet more than Fate
Herself inflicts, by their own wickedness incur.
So now Ægisthus, by no force constrained

Of Destiny, Atrides' wedded wife

Took to himself, and him at his return

Slew, not unwarned of his own dreadful end;

Hermes forewarned, but his advice moved not

Ægisthus, on whose head the whole arrear

Of vengeance, heaped at last, hath therefore fallen."

Cowper's Odyssey, Bk. I., 40-55.

In these passages, and others that might be adduced, we cannot fail to mark the similarity, and are almost forced to compare Olympus and Heaven. Milton, we feel, was shackled by Epic rules and the example of his great model, and too freely mingled together the ideas of Mythology and Christianity. In many cases where this mingling is open and avowed, we cannot but believe that the purpose of the poet might have been much better attained had he avoided such a course; but where the spirits of the two are secretly intermingled, and the heathen and Christian ideas blend as one, so that we hardly detect the former, we think the evil is of the greatest importance. This almost necessarily arises from forming a Scriptural poem upon a mythological model. Dante has escaped this snare, and has filled his Heaven with the glory of Him who hid the prophet in the rock on Sinai, rather than the earthly pomp and splendor of Olympus. Milton was deeply versed in the Scriptures and the classics; but when he attempted to graft the pure and unearthly spirit of the former upon the elegant and exact model of the latter, the two blended together, and the earthly tainted the vision of Heaven.

But there remains another reason which we would suggest for the inferiority of the third book. The conversation of the Father and the Son fulfils one great design of the poet by unfolding the plan of grace, and displaying the means by which that dreadful calamity, developed at large in the rest of the poem, should finally be removed. It seems to us that Milton found one great reason for dissatisfaction with his subject, and that this dissatisfaction remained even after the work was completed, and gave rise both to the Paradise Regained and to the author's singular preference for that work. He felt that he portrayed the triumph of evil over good, and loved to show that

that triumph was of short duration; the "evil times" on which he had fallen, and the victorious spread of wickedness in society around him may have increased that desire. He felt also that the real hero of his poem, the one whose grandeur and whose character were most felt, was not Adam, nor an angel from Heaven, nor even the Son himself, but the leader of the rebellious hosts. This he sought to obviate by developing that victory of the Son over Satan which drove the revolting legions to the pit of hell; this justified the long episode of the fifth, sixth and seventh books, comprising one fourth of the entire poem. Yet even this must leave Satan still the hero, since in the plot of the poem he attains that great revenge he so eagerly sought. From the nature of his subject this could not be obviated, and he sought to weaken its effect by throwing open to us the counsels of Heaven, and revealing that certain and humiliating defeat which in due time should come upon the arch fiend. Yet we are forced to condemn the attempt to explain a religious doctrine by means of a conversation between the persons of the God-head, as peculiarly unfortunate. Nowhere in the Bible do we have the Deity thus represented to us as setting forth the counsels of eternity, logically and minutely, in order to defend them; and in venturing upon such a design, the poet has fallen into several grave errors. First he has made the Almighty descend to the use of the language of an astute logician and divine.

"Man disobeying,
Disloyal, breaks his fealty, and sins
Against the high supremacy of heaven,
Affecting godhead, and, so losing all,
To expiate his treason hath nought left,
But to destruction sacred and devote,
He with his whole posterity must die.
Die he, or justice must."

This passage, and numerous others like it may be found, would be much more appropriate in the mouth of one of the doctors of the "Provincial Letters" than as an utterance from the throne of Heaven. Turn to the prophets and read those solemn and awful messages of Jehovah, the "thus saith the Lord," the "I will destroy," and "I will build up," and one reason for the disappointment already referred to in reading this third book will be apparent. When God saith, "Come let us reason together," and again in Ezekiel, "Yet ye say the way of the Lord is not equal. O ye house of Israel I will judge you every one after his way," even in the condescension there are the words of almighty power, there is the awful presence of the Ruler of the universe. We fail to recall a single passage of Scripture where this distance between God and man, and between God's ways and thoughts and man's, is not scrupulously preserved.

Intimately connected with this is another error which we cannot overlook. The poet has represented the Deity as defending himself. He has the same topics discussed in Heaven as in Hell:

"Providence, foreknowledge, will and fate; Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute."

But in Heaven, he represents God himself, before the Son and the high powers of Heaven, exculpating himself from all blame in the matter of man's fall. Afterwards the Son replies in a similar strain, showing what we cannot designate in any other way than the bad policy of leaving men to the ruin they have incurred, and closing with a couplet which seems little short of profane:

"So should thy goodness and thy greatness both Be questioned and blasphemed without defence."

Such ideas we most unhesitatingly pronounce unworthy of the Christian's God, and the whole discussion, both in the manner and the substance of it, as beneath the Christian ideal of his dignity and majesty.

Thirdly, we think that even the minutest matters, in such a conversation as that between the Father and Son, are worthy of notice, and accordingly venture to call attention to a few expressions which are so manifestly inappropriate to the august character of the speakers as to need no further comment. The Son says of his triumph after the expiation: "I shall lead hell captive, maugre hell," and a little before it, for a like rhetorical

effect, "Death his death's wound shall then receive." Again the Father speaking of the impenitent says: "But hard be hardened, blind be blinded more," and expressions similar to these, objectionable only as petty rhetorical tricks, are very numerous. But what shall we say of the use of epithets like these by the Father? In speaking of man's fall he says, "Whose fault? whose but his own? Ingrate, he had of me all he could have," &c.; and in speaking of Satan he says, that the revenge he seeks to take on man "shall redound upon his own rebellious head;" he says of the impenitent, that they shall "oft be warned their sinful state, and to appease betimes the incensed Deity." To feel the full effect of these epithets it is necessary to read them in their connection, and when thus read, we believe they tend very much to increase the unpleasant. impressions these passages create. They would be entirely appropriate for an excitable man, not as objectionable if God were conversing with man; but spoken only before the "sanctities of Heaven," we consider them ill-timed and unbecoming.

We have confined ourselves in the main to the Third Book, because we think the failure of the poet is most commonly felt in reading this scene in Heaven. Yet we are well aware that the same characteristics appear elsewhere in the representation of heavenly scenes and the character of the Deity. Indeed, Raphael's description of Heaven in the Fifth Book seems to us almost deserving of the severe censure of the extract from Prof. Draper's History. The dance of the angels around the sacred hill, in whose motions

"Harmony divine

So smooths her charming tones, that God's own ear Listens delighted."

The evening repast that follows, in which the tables are "piled with angels' food," and the "rubied nectar flows," while they with "fresh flowerets crowned," repose on flowers; and finally, the sleep which after the repast comes over all except God himself and his immediate attendants, and the plotting archangel who draws away a third of Heaven's sons to war against the Eternal under the cover of the darkness, though very beautiful as poetry, is so utterly opposed to all our ideas

of the sacred things of Heaven, that these pleasant images of earthly beauty and delight, in such connection, serve only to awaken displeasure and dislike. They too forcibly recall the Homeric Olympus, even to the sacred hill around which the angels dance, and the high mountain which is the seat of the Deity. The speech of the Father, and the Son's reply, which follow these passages, seem to us to approach nearer profanity than anything else we have found in Paradise Lost. The Father sees the assembling of the rebel hosts, and says to the Son—

"Nearly it now concerns us to be sure Of our omnipotence, and with what arms We mean to hold what anciently we claim Of Deity or empire."

"Let us advise, and to this hazard draw
With speed what force is left, and all employ
In our defence, lest unawares we lose
This our high place, our sanctuary, our high hill."

Such 'ideas as these, spoken by the great Ruler of the Universe, seem to us little short of blasphemous. It is as though God trembled for the safety of his throne, and hurriedly collected all the remaining forces of Heaven to repel the threatening danger which might take Him unawares. We deem the boast which closes the reply of the Son exceedingly inappropriate; it reminds us of the address of one of the heroes of the Iliad before joining battle. He says it shall be matter of glory to him

"When they shall see all regal power Given to quell their pride, and in event Know whether I be dexterous to subdue Thy rebels, or be found the worst in heaven."

We must be pardoned for referring briefly to one other passage. The battle of the angels seems to us filled with hopeless incongruities. We would not go so far as Dr. Johnson, and class it as a kind of child's wonder book; yet with all its learning and all its poetic beauties, it is eminently unsatisfactory. We can only speak our own experience; but we are forced to acknowledge that we have ever failed to rise

with the poet in the description of this conflict. It seems to us so far to exceed possibility, so hopelessly to blend and confuse together the incongruities of flesh and spirit, so to mix up Heaven with earth, and heavenly conflicts with earthly and carnal ones, that the mind shrinks back from it with displeasure, and fails to receive the inspiration and enthusiasm which the poet strives to impart. It is vast without being grand, terrible without being sublime. We regret also that in describing the arming of the Son for the final conflict, the poet has kept so steadily in view the gods of the Greeks, and given Him the chariot of Poseiden whose "rapid wheels" "shake heaven's basis," and the terrible thunder of Zeus. The bad effect of this, however, is afterwards almost entirely removed by the magnificent description of the chariot with all its gorgeous imagery, borrowed from the opening vision of Ezekiel's prophecies.

The results to which these considerations lead us may be briefly stated. We believe that the poet has fallen below his own ideal of the majesty of God, because, in the first place, mythological ideas have imperceptibly insinuated themselves into his representations; and secondly, because he sacrificed much to show the final victory of good over evil, and by the nature of his subject was forced to represent God as foretelling these future events and the reasons of them, and hence was led to exhibit him as defending himself from possible criminations, with somewhat of the astute logic of the schoolmen, and the rhetorical flourish of the sophists. These certainly have detracted seriously from the success of his attempt. Nor would we underestimate their influence. Surely, so far as it goes, it is an evil which cannot be too carefully guarded Yet before adopting Prof. Draper's opinion, we would suggest some manifest limitations. And first, that very few educated men read Paradise Lost as a text-book in ethics or theology, but simply as a poem, as they would read Homer or Virgil. The very mythological ideas we have pointed out, and the very striking likeness to the classics of Greece and Rome, would tend to put the poem upon the same ground as those heathen writings. It is a noble work of art, and they admire it as they would a picture of the Madonna, not with reverence and crossings and prayers, but with an enthusiastic appreciation of its artistic merits. Milton's Heaven, like Homer's, is but the creation of a poet's brain. When thus considered, its influences are all indirect, and are greater than those of the Odyssey or the Æneid, solely because the foundation of the poem is, in the main, the Christian Scriptures.

Secondly, when we speak of these indirect influences we must consider also the counteracting ones in the same poem. The whole spirit of the poem is eminently religious. Underlying these faults we have examined, is the poet's lofty idea of the Almighty, derived from an attentive study of his revealed word, which is felt constantly by every appreciative reader, notwithstanding the difficulties besetting its delineation. We have designated the effect of the first part of the Third Book as unpleasant, and this, we think, describes the impression it leaves. And why? Simply because it falls below what we expected, and what we are forced to believe the poet designed. The reasons of this disappointment are only developed by a more careful study and analysis.

Lastly, we deny that there is any "materialization of the great and invisible God;" and that, in any proper sense of the word, Paradise Lost can be called a "Manichean composition." In no case do we have any representation of the Deity in bodily form, or any acts ascribed to Him which we conceive to be incompatible with pure spirit. The conquest of the Son over the hosts of the fallen forms the only apparent exception to this remark, and scriptural examples to justify this might easily be multiplied. The angels, and heaven itself, appear oftentimes earthly, but the poet has ever stopped short of applying such properties to the Deity. In making God to converse as man, he has ample justification in the example of Holy Writ; and if he has failed to impart to the discourses attributed to the Deity that dignity and majesty which is befitting them, he has very rarely departed so far from it as seriously to offend against our religious feelings. The very fact that Paradise Lost has been so long and so generally received as a Christian poem proves this, and that wherein

the poet has fallen short, is as much against the general spirit and design of his work, as it is against the feelings of his most devout and pious readers. We cannot conceive how the strife between good and evil angels, which is terminated by a most disastrous defeat of the legions of Satan the moment that the Deity interposes, can justify the charge of Manicheism, nor can we conceive how, with any propriety, such a charge can be founded upon one address of the Father, which is as much at variance with the rest of the poem as it is with the Christian idea of divine omnipotence; and, aside from these two instances, we know of nothing in the whole poem which can be called Manichean, unless the same epithet can be applied to the corresponding teachings of Scripture.

In conclusion, we will quote a short paragraph from Spalding's "History of English Literature," which happily expresses what we consider the right view of Paradise Lost: "If the poet has sometimes aimed at describing scenes over which should have been cast the veil of reverential silence, we shall remember that this occurs but rarely. If other scenes and figures of a supernatural kind are invested with a costume which seems to us unduly corporeal, even for the poetic inventor, we should pause to recollect that the task thus attempted is one in which perfect success is unattainable; and we shall ourselves, unless our fancy is cold indeed, be awed and dazzled, whether we will or not, by many of those

very pictures."

ARICLE IV.—DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY FOR CHRISTIAN PASTORS.*

BY REV. ALVAH HOVEY, D. D., PROF. IN NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.

It is said by the Apostle, Ephesians iv: 11, that Christ, having ascended up far above all heavens, gave to his people several kinds of office-bearers, and among them "pastors and teachers." These two words describe men holding one and the same office, but by an allusion to different aspects of their work. In other passages of the New Testament, they are called bishops or elders. Thus, in the twentieth chapter of the Acts, we are told that Paul sent from Miletus to Ephesus, and called the "elders of the church," while, in his address to these men, he denominates them "overseers," or bishops of the flock. It will be interesting to compare the words of his letter to the Ephesian Christians with his parting charge to their elders. "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things. And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come, in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with his own blood," etc.

It may be assumed that nearly all who are looking forward to the work of preaching the gospel in a Christian land, expect to do this in the pastoral office. And a large share of those who are called to enter the ministry will spend their days in such a land. They ought,

^{*}A Discourse preached before the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education, May 13, 1863, at Rochester.

therefore, to be qualified for the pastoral office; and to be qualified for this office they ought, according to the language of the Apostle which I have repeated, to be not only zealous and of ready speech, but also sound in the faith, well-instructed, and able rightly to divide the word of truth. As guides and teachers they should be enriched with knowledge, scribes ready in the law, prepared to instruct the people of God, to feed the flock of Christ with heavenly food. The treasures of sacred learning should be at their command; and whatever study may be necessary to secure this should be cheerfully undertaken. In the best sense of the expression, pastors should be learned as well as devout.

This position is still controverted by some of our brethren, and hence both duty and inclination lead me to offer a plea at the present time in favor of ministerial education. I cannot, however, discuss the topic in all its breadth, but must restrict myself to a part of the field; and it is natural for me to choose a part with which my daily thoughts are occupied. Yet this is not the chief reason which has led to the topic soon to be stated. For besides the objections which are still urged by certain persons to ministerial education in general, weighty considerations are sometimes said to lie against the study of doctrinal theology in particular. This part of a "regular course" is supposed, by not a few ministers and laymen, to turn away the mind from the oracles of God, to beget a philosophizing spirit, to form a cautious and negative habit of thinking, to quench the flame of Christian zeal, and to render the style dry, cold and tame. It has been thought to foster speculation, and open the door to heresy, tempting some to leave the solid ground and sail through the upper air-a grief to wise men and the admiration of fools. I have, therefore, deemed it suitable to lay before you at this time a few thoughts on the study of doctrinal theology in preparing for the pastoral office. These thoughts will afford, if not a formal, yet, I trust, a substantial answer to the charges just mentioned.

The course of study which I propose to justify, may be described as a patient and faithful endeavor to ascertain the principal doctrines of Christianity, and their relations in

Scripture and reason to one another. The word of God, like the natural world, gives one aspect of a truth here and another there, one relation of it in this passage and another in that, now picturing it to the eye in symbol, and then illustrating it in history; and the course of study to which I call your attention seeks, in the first place, to obtain a clear view of every separate aspect and relation of this truth; and in the second, to unite the different phases of it into one full-orbed doctrine; and lastly, to find the place of this doctrine in the great system of Christian truth, that all parts of the same may stand together before the mind in visible harmony, revealing the matchless wisdom of God. Such a course of study, even though the end which it contemplates be not fully reached, will do much to prepare him who takes it with a reverent spirit for the work of a Christian pastor. This statement may be vindicated by showing, 1st, That a knowledge of doctrinal theology is exceedingly desirable for pastors; a proposition which may be justified by the following considerations:

It meets a want of their rational nature, a deep-seated and universal desire, given with the reason itself and sanctioned by the creative act. When Consentius wrote to Augustine, laying down the position that in matters of religion "reason should not so much be consulted as rather the authority of holy men be followed," the bishop of Hippo replied: "Correct your position, not indeed by saying that you will repudiate faith, but that you will seek to see in the light of reason those truths which you now hold by the grasp of faith. Far be it from God to hate in us that by which He has made us to excel other creatures. Far be it from us to believe for the sake of not accepting or seeking a reason for the truth; since we could not even believe did we not possess rational souls." And while he asserts that "faith has, as it were, eyes of its own, by which in a certain way it sees that to be true which it does not yet see," he distinctly affirms that "whoever now understands by true reason what he once merely believed, is surely in advance of him who is yet desiring to understand what he believes, and, still more, of him who is ignorant of the true office of faith, and does not even long to comprehend

those things which may be known." While he contends that faith ought many times to precede reason, he also shows that there must be a rational ground in every instance for this order. "If it is reasonable," he argues, "that as to certain great truths which we cannot yet compass, faith should anticipate reason, without doubt so much of reason as persuades us of this does itself go before faith."

In other words, man has a rational nature, made for the apprehension of truth as evidently as the lungs were made for the reception of air; and the possession of this nature by the proper act of God is warrant enough for its use and culture. Reason is not a disease of the soul brought on by apostacy. It was in man from the first, and took rank with his noblest faculties. Its health is no less essential to the proper life of the soul than health of the lungs is to the life of the body. But the aliment of sound reason is truth, and the higher its character, the purer its moral beauty, the more august its relations and offices, the better is it fitted to fill up the growing capacities of reason with light and power. For the Christian there is but one way to answer the cry of his rational nature, but one way to appease the hunger of his soul for knowledge. By the study of divine things, by a diligent inquiry after the vital truths of our holy religion, by a prayerful endeavor to obtain a distinct view of the Sun of righteousness with all the circling orbs of spiritual light which go to make up the system of Christian truth, and to ray out before an intelligent universe the glory of God, may he satisfy the just claims of a God-given reason without injury to faith; but in no other way.

Let it also be remembered that, in the Christian, knowledge and faith are homogeneous and inseparable. It is no more possible for them to exist apart from each other, in the present life, than it is for a renewed soul to have faith without love, or love without faith. They pass into each other like the colors of the rainbow, and the presence of one proves the existence of the other. The point where faith ends and knowledge begins can never be fixed; for all warranted belief is grounded in moral reason or intuition, while

the clearest knowledge resting upon moral evidence is but faith strengthened into assurance. Hence, to believe God, and to know God, are almost equivalent expressions in the Bible.

And let it further be remembered, for it is an axiom, that related truths must belong to a system; they cannot stand apart in solitary grandeur, like the pillars of a ruined city; nor can they disagree and wage relentless war with each other; but by their very nature they must stand together, and each be stronger for the union. It is therefore impossible to comprehend any one of them without seeing its connection with the rest, and noting the points which unite it with other members of the system. The relations of doctrine must be studied in order to know the strength of the Christian edifice, or even the firmness of a single pillar in this spiritual temple. And so it comes to pass that an axiom of reason adds its voice to the claim and hunger of our rational nature in favor of doctrinal study.

Nor is it easy to resist their united influence. Indeed, we are permitted to acknowledge, with thanks to the Author of all good, that some, who scout systematic theology in word, honor it in action. A sound mind compels them to sanction in substance what a misconception leads them to condemn in name. They are borne on by the deep under-current of their rational nature to seek that very knowledge which they sincerely profess to shun. Hence, none better than they maintain the "form of sound words," or more distinctly than they see the sacred truth, which fills the form, and flashes through it and from it in beams of light. But whether all who decry a "knowledge of the doctrines" have secured, though unwittingly, any appreciable amount of this treasure, is a question which I forbear to press.

It appears from what has been said, that a knowledge of doctrinal theology is desirable for pastors, because it meets a great want of their rational nature.

But this is not all. Let us make a step in advance and say, that it meets a want of their moral nature. The Christian religion exalts the idea of duty. It proposes divine rectitude as the proper standard of moral excellence. It aims to purify the conscience and render its action perfect. One of its ablest teachers declared, "Herein do I exercise myself, to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and men." But the doctrines of this religion are immutable truth. Heaven and earth may pass away, but they will remain the same. To modify them is a fearful sin, defiling the conscience and provoking the wrath of God. It is therefore self-evident, that no teacher of these doctrines can safely neglect to seek the best knowledge of them within his reach. This knowledge should be so deep and clear and completely absorbed into his spiritual being, as to mould his language unconsciously, and secure his boldest and freest utterances from extravagance. The "winged words" which rush from his tongue, glowing with emotion and charged with electric power, should still be under law to truth. His perception of the contrast between the glowing disk of this orb and the surrounding penumbra whence heresies take their rise, should be so distinct, that no out-break of emotion will carry him beyond the certain light of the former into the treacherous obscurity of the latter. His views of the cardinal doctrines should be settled. And if nearly every doctrine of the Christian religion is set forth in the Bible fragmentarily, one side of it here and another there, so that in order to get as full a view of it as possible, Scripture must be compared with Scripture, prophecy with history, the shadows of an earlier economy with the substance of a later, then is a knowledge of doctrine, gained by a survey of the whole record and by a comparison of different enunciations of the same essential truth, very necessary to satisfy the conscience. And further, if the truths of Christianity are related to one another, and form a consistent whole, if, for example, the biblical doctrine of regeneration presupposes that of human depravity and that of sovereign grace or election, and, less obviously though not less really every other truth of the system, so that a misrepresentation of any one doctrine carries with it a perversion of all the rest, then assuredly must the knowledge for which we plead be necessary to preserve the moral nature from outrage and defilement.

Let the preaching of a pastor be fairly considered,—how often he comes before his charge to expound the meaning of Scripture; how often he makes a single clause the theme of a discourse; how often he must decide between a figurative and a literal sense of the words; how often their true meaning is fixed by the doctrine of other passages or the analogy of faith; how great the need of something more than earnest exhortation or random guesses at truth; how imperative the call for bold and positive exhibitions of doctrine, duty or motive, and how brief the time allotted to weekly preparation for the Sabbath, — and it will appear that one who has not, by careful study, ascertained at least the cardinal principles of revealed truth, and settled in his mind the outlines of a theological system, is led by the exigencies of his work into the jaws of temptation. He is in a strait betwixt two; desiring to heed the monition of conscience and utter Christian truth without any mixture of error, and also desiring to treat every passage which he takes in hand boldly, vigorously and impressively. Is it not more than probable that sometimes the whisper of conscience will be unheeded, and the pressure of circumstances, with a longing for effect, lead the hapless teacher to "be rash with his mouth?" And should his bold handling of the word prove to be apparently useful, is he not in danger of sinning yet more against the majesty of truth, if not of being caught in the meshes of the subtlest falsehood of Roman Ethics, that "the end sanctifies the means?" I speak only, as you will observe, of a danger or temptation from which we should strive to be saved; whether any persons could be mentioned, who, after years of labor in the ministry, have no settled views of doctrine, but are all afloat and seem to be carried hither and thither by the instinct or impulse of the moment, is a matter of less consequence. The peril to which I have referred is manifest and great; it threatens the purity and power of conscience, and the duty of guarding against it is obvious. It follows that a knowledge of doctrinal theology meets a want of the pastor's moral nature.

Nor is this all. Let us take another step and say that it is

equally essential to his spiritual good. His growth in grace will be promoted by it. While some degree of Christian experience goes before a true knowledge of religious doctrines, and no man is able without a new heart to understand the nature of piety, or to obtain a right conception of theological science, it is also true, in the words of another, that "the science of theology, when constructed in a Christian spirit, has a practical and edifying character." Nay, the fact that true piety is the chief qualification for the study of theology, is itself an evidence that the knowledge to be gained by such study is favorable to genuine piety. They are correlates, and their adaptation to each other shows that they ought to be united. Wherefore all this spiritual light, and this spiritual eye to receive it, if the light be not meant for the renewed soul and will not quicken its growth in grace? Whence the extraordinary faith, and love, and zeal, which kindle the pages and burn in the sentences of John and Paul, of Augustine and Anselm, of Bunyan and Edwards, not to mention the names of hundreds more, if their piety was not nourished by their profound knowledge of the doctrines? It may not be extravagant to say, that they as far outstripped other ministers of the word in Christian zeal and devotion as they did in theological knowledge. They did not remain through life babes in Christ, having need of milk, but they became in due time mature in knowledge and experience, capable of meat, and having their spiritual senses trained by use to discern both good and evil.

But I need not detain you with illustrations. The protestant world repudiates the maxim that "ignorance is the mother of devotion." It maintains that Christian truth is good and wholesome, adapted to nourish every spiritual grace, a savor of life unto life to all that believe. It holds that the people of God are sanctified by living in the atmosphere of truth, and inhaling it at every breath. It asserts that the wisdom of God in a mystery has been revealed for the edification and comfort of his chosen. It declares that light is sown for the righteous and gratefully appropriates the words of Paul: "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness hath shined in our hearts unto the light of the knowledge of the glory of God

in the face of Jesus Christ."

It is therefore too late for any one to call in question, before this assembly of Protestants, the fitness of religious truth to support and increase spiritual life. The only questions which can be deemed still open are these: When and how should this truth be brought before the mind? How long should the believer wait before he ventures to explore the deep things of religion? And by what method of study will he be most likely to obtain the truth in its fulness and purity? I beg leave to offer a few words in reply to these questions.

In answer to the former, when should this truth be brought before the mind, it will be sufficient to remark that no man is qualified in character for the office of a bishop, who is a novice, immature, easily shaken, incapable of looking into and receiving some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction. The epistle to the Hebrews speaks of certain persons who had been believers long enough to be teachers, but who still needed to be taught the first principles of Christian doctrine, to be fed with milk and not with meat. The implication is plain: one who is not sufficiently mature in knowledge and experience to profit by the deeper truths of our holy religion is not mature enough to become at once a pastor and teacher.

In reply to the latter, how should this truth be brought before the mind, a word may be spoken in favor of Christian theology. Whatever spiritual benefit may flow to the soul from a knowledge of single phases or points of doctrine, it may certainly be augmented by a larger view, embracing many related truths and noting their moral harmony. Far be it from me to depreciate any branch of Christian knowledge, as that of biblical interpretation or of church history; but I must distinctly affirm that a knowledge of the principal doctrines of Christianity, in their plainest relations to one another, is a further and important source of spiritual good, making the current of religious life broader and deeper. It was after Paul had proved the universal sinfulness of mankind, as the children of Adam, and the consequent impossibility of their salvation by obedience to the law; had set forth the vicarious

and propitiatory death of Christ as an exhibition of God's righteousness and the only sufficient reason for justifying believers; had shown that already before the advent of Christ men had been saved on the same principle and in view of the same atonement as since; had dwelt on the sovereign purpose of God in choosing from a guilty race some to be trophies of his mercy and in leaving the rest to suffer the just penalty of their sins; had contemplated the inseparable union established by the Spirit of God between the believer and his glorious Head; and had spoken at length of Jewish unbelief as providentially overruled to the saving of many Gentiles, with a glance forward to the day when Jews and Greeks shall blend their voices in homage to Jesus, —it was after this train of luminous thought, this wide survey of essential doctrines and allied facts, that his emotions of admiration and love broke out in the oft repeated words: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable his judgments, and his ways past finding out! . . . For of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen." And the religious sensibilities of this apostle were not peculiar. The laws of his spiritual life were the same which hold in the case of every true Christian; and a similar survey of the far-reaching yet connected doctrines of religion will awaken in other hearts the same high and holy emotions which he felt.

I must, however, leave this thought, and pass on to say that christian pastors need to be well grounded in theology for the good of their people, as well as for their own good. For whether we look at their avowed purpose or at the will of Christ, no one of them liveth to himself. Hence the knowledge in question has to them an even greater official than personal value. It goes to qualify them for their ministry and to make them good "stewards of the mysteries of God."

In proof of this I may remind you of the general fact, that a man's power to benefit others depends greatly upon what he is himself. As a rule, he will stand, morally and religiously, in the community where he labors, for what he is worth. Intelligence, uprightness and piety will make themselves felt

in a thousand ways, and by a sort of unconscious influence do their proper work in society. Whatever, therefore, improves the man and Christian, improves the pastor and teacher; and if a knowledge of theology satisfies real wants of his rational, moral and religious nature, enlarging, building up, completing his Christian manhood, it must indirectly add to his spiritual power and accrue to the benefit of his flock.

But it does this also directly. Over and above its influence upon the preacher's character, it has a bearing upon the substance and form of his message. It gives clearness, precision, depth and soundness. It enables him to lay hold of principles, and set them forth with effect. It prepares him to shun the by-paths of error, and to withstand the assaults of unbelief. It gives consistency to his teaching, and diminishes the work of preparation for the pulpit. But, to show its value more clearly, I will speak of the two-fold purpose of the ministry, namely: the conversion of sinners, and the edification of believers.

A knowledge of theology may be of great service to a pastor in his efforts to save the ungodly. I do not pronounce it indispensable, or place it on a level with fervent piety, or say it is of any use alone, but I simply affirm that it may be of great service to a pastor in this part of his work. An ignorant Christian may point a sinner to the Lamb of God, and no man should hesitate from want of learning to speak a word for Jesus; but the fullest knowledge of truth will not be found too great for him who is to claim the attention of unbelievers in public, expound to them the law of heaven, lay open to conscience their deep depravity, and persuade them to be reconciled to God.

Ten years ago a great and venerable man, whose words are never empty and rarely unwise, endeavored to explain before you the simple idea of preaching, by the following incident.*

^{*}The two following paragraphs were reluctantly penned, and yet more reluctantly given to the public. The distinguished author of "The Apostolic Ministry" has in his "Letters on the Ministry of the Gospel," recently published, set forth the preacher's work in a very adequate and satisfactory manner. Still his earlier discourse is in the hands of many, and the main idea of preach-

"It so chanced, that, at the close of the last war with Great Britain, I was temporarily a resident of the city of New York. The prospects of the nation were shrouded in gloom. We had been for two or three years at war with the mightiest nation on earth, and as she had now concluded a peace with the continent of Europe, we were obliged to cope with her singlehanded. Our harbors were blockaded. Communication coast-wise, between our ports, was cut off. Our ships were rotting in every creek and cove where they could find a place of security. Our immense annual products were moulding in our warehouses. The sources of profitable labor were dried up. Our currency was reduced to irredeemable paper. The extreme portions of our country were becoming hostile to each other, and differences of political opinion were embittering the peace of every household. The credit of the government was exhausted. No one could predict when the contest would terminate, or discover the means by which it could much longer be protracted. It happened that on a Saturday afternoon in February, a ship was discovered in the offing, which was supposed to be a cartel, bringing home our Commissioners at Ghent, from their unsuccessful mission. The sun had set gloomily, before any intelligence from the vessel had reached the city. Expectation became painfully intense, as the hours of darkness drew on. At length a boat reached the wharf, announcing the fact that a treaty of peace had been signed, and was waiting for nothing but the action of our government to become a law. The men on whose ears these words first fell, rushed in breathless haste into the city, to repeat them to their friends, shouting, as they ran through the streets, peace! peace! peace! Every one who heard the sound repeated it. From house to house, from street to street, the news spread with electric rapidity. The whole city was in commotion. Men bearing lighted torches were flying to and fro shouting like madmen peace! peace! When the rapture had partially subsided, one idea occupied every mind. But few men slept that

ing taught in that discourse is, I believe, fairly represented by the extract above, and answered in the succeeding paragraph; it may therefore be well for them both to remain as they were delivered before the Union.

658

night. In groups they were gathered in the streets and by the fire-side, beguiling the hours of midnight by reminding each other that the agony of war was over, and that a worn out and distracted country was about to enter again upon its wonted career of prosperity. Thus, every one becoming a herald, the news soon reached every man, woman and child in the city, and, in this sense, the city was evangelized. . . This then is, I think, the generic idea of preaching conveyed in the New Testament. It is the proclamation to every creature, of the love of God to men through Christ Jesus. This is the main idea."

How perfect this description of a thrilling event! Every sentence adds life to the picture till we see the people rushing through the streets, frantic with joy, and hear the cry of peace, peace, from a thousand lips, far and near. All thoughts, interests, emotions, are driven like autumn leaves before the rush of that one joyful message. And if those at war with the King of Heaven were not wilfully blind, and deaf, and obstinate, preferring evil to good, and rebellion to loyalty-if some of them were not saying in their hearts: "No God!" and others, "How doth God know?" and yet others, "Can He judge through the thick cloud?"-if in this avenue there were no Pharisees, making broad their phylacteries and gathering about them the robe of self-righteousness, and in that street no servants of Mammon, busy with their merchandise and laying plans to tear down and build greater, and in yonder lighted halls no votaries of pleasure, saying: "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die,"-if the people understood the resources of Him whose power they have defied and saw the gathering storm of wrath about to fall upon their heads,-if they knew themselves to be bankrupt, impotent, defenceless, felt the miseries of their present lot and foresaw their utter overthrow and ruin in the future,-if they were oppressed with a sense of their perilous state, weary of the hopeless conflict, ready to ground the weapons of their rebellion, and longing for peace with God,—in a word, if they were just what they are not, truly penitent for their sins and anxious for the divine favor, then would they hear the glad news of pardon through Christ even as the people of our great metropolis heard the tidings of peace in the evening twilight of that memorable day, and the work of an evangelist would require little more than fervid zeal, with swiftness of foot and strength of lungs. But alas! alas! no such welcome greets the herald of peace from the courts of Heaven. No such preparation opens for him a way to every heart. Some hear his message with the ear, but give no heed to its meaning. Some admit its weight, but defer action for the present. Some deny its truth, or attempt to pervert its language. Some reject the gospel peace and devise a plan of their own. Some are careless, some busy, some reckless, and all with one consent begin to make excuse. It is therefore necessary for the ambassadors of Christ to urge their message upon reason, conscience and heart, to depict the majesty of their King, the guilt of those who trample on his authority, the ruin which persistent rebellion will bring on them, the blessedness in store for all who accept of pardon through Christ, the nature of this act of acceptance, and the danger unspeakable of postponing it for an hour. To do this they should know, if possible, all the weapons in the armory of truth, and be able to conquer the reason, pierce the conscience, alarm the fears, and touch the sensibilities. They should be able to follow up their work from week to week, giving the sinner no rest from argument, admonition, entreaty, till he is brought to cry for pardon. Swiftness of foot and strength of lungs, though moved by zeal, will not suffice for this work. Great faith, rich experience, and abundant knowledge are in full request.

But the work of Christian pastors has respect to others besides the ungodly. When the elders of the Ephesian Church had come at Paul's request to Miletus, he reviewed his own ministry with them and added this charge: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God which He hath purchased with his own blood." And, writing to the Ephesians, he speaks of "pastors and teachers" as being given "for the perfecting of the saints," "for the edifying of the body of Christ," and makes the aim and end of their work

to be this, that believers "be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine," but perfect men, having "come into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God." And this is not all. In his address to the elders he forebodes the coming "in of grievous wolves, not sparing the flock," and the rising up of heretics in the church itself, "speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them;" while in his letter to the Ephesians he refers to "the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." So likewise does he remind Timothy that "some will depart from the faith, speaking lies in hypocrisy;" and correcting a few of their errors, he says: "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus, nourished up in the words of faith and of sound doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained." The members of our churches ought therefore to be carefully indoctrinated, to prevent them from falling into hurtful errors, to strengthen their Christian virtues, and to qualify them for usefulness.

They should be well grounded in a knowledge of the doctrines to protect them from the assaults of error. perhaps, since the advent of Christ, have more zeal and adroitness been employed in leading the simple astray, than at the present time. Satan masks his batteries, displays a counterfeit banner of truth, transforms himself into an angel of light, adapts his doctrine to the weakness or prejudice of his victim, does everything which craft can devise or malice execute, to lure the unwary from their allegiance to Christ. Just at the point where some great doctrine rises above the human understanding and expands into the infinite, or just at the point where it presses heavily on the conscience and rouses the hostility of a sinful heart, a slight change of view is proposed, a change which the Word of God, with no great violence to its obvious meaning, is said to permit, and withal a change so helpful to charity, so agreeable to feeling, so full of relief to a stout will and sore conscience, that the half taught and unsuspecting child of faith welcomes it at once; not knowing that it necessitates a change in every doctrine of Christianity, and

will carry him at length into the arms of "another gospel;" not knowing that it will weaken his faith, withdraw him from Christ, and hinder his growth in grace, if it does not destroy his soul. Forewarned, forearmed. Had he been made thoroughly acquainted with the leading truths of Christianity, and with the points from which errors do and must take their departure, he would have rejected at once the slight but fatal change proposed, and would have clung with steadfast faith to the certain truth of God. Hence it is the duty of pastors to be teachers of sound doctrine, preparing the members of their spiritual flock to shun all the snares and pitfalls of error.

It is also their duty to instruct believers in the principles of Christian truth, in order by so doing to promote their spiritual growth. The knowledge thus given will meet, as we have already seen, a great want of human nature, whether contemplated as rational, moral or religious. I must not tax your patience by going over the ground again, however much could be added to the argument, but will simply ask you to bear in mind that these three departments of our spiritual being, and modes of our spiritual life and action, interpenetrate one another, so that what is for the good of one is for the good of all, and what is hurtful to one injures all. The strictly religious emotions, faith, love, adoration, cannot be pure and healthful while the intuitions of moral right or the impulses of conscience are disregarded. Genuine piety and morality will flourish or languish together. The same is true of reason and faith: they cannot be divorced; and if one of them suffers, the other must suffer with it. A robust, manly, growing piety must be intelligent, rooted indeed in love, but nourished by the words of sound doctrine. It may be found where there is zeal according to knowledge, but not where reason is despised and blind emotion deified, nor where feeling is set at naught and logic enthroned as a god. Weeds grow without culture, and errors flourish in the dark; but true religion claims a prepared soil, a warm light, refreshing showers and varied culture; for it promises a perfect fruit, a living soul, large, strong, Vol. xxviii.-43

pure, complete, every faculty matured, every susceptibility refined, every stain removed. Time and culture are requisite, and the work of the spiritual husbandman is but just begun when the seed of divine truth first takes root in the regenerated heart; it must be watched and watered and kept in the sun; the weeds of error must not be suffered to take its life, nor the cares of the world to choke it. In a word Christian pastors are called to labor for the spiritual growth of those in the churches, and to make them familiar with the doctrines of Christianity is one of the best means of doing this.

Thirdly, they ought carefully to indoctrinate believers for the sake of augmenting their usefulness. Pastors are not called to stand alone and labor without sympathy or aid. Many of those to whom they preach should be efficient helpers in the work, established in doctrine, wise in counsel, blameless in life, and prompt in action. In some of his letters Paul commends churches as a whole for their faith, love, knowledge, and various members in particular for their fidelity and co-operation. He expected to receive spiritual benefit from intercourse with the saints in Rome, being comforted by their faith; he gave thanks to God on behalf of the Corinthians, that in everything they were enriched by Christ in all utterance and in all knowledge; and he rejoiced in the faith of the Colossians, and their love to all the saints, praying that they might be filled with the knowledge of Christ's will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding. Is it not plain that the apostle highly valued the influence of laymen in the church?—that he not only wished them to grow in grace and knowledge, but relied upon them as helpers in making known the truth, and persuading men to receive it? And John says, "I write unto you, young men, because ye are strong and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one." He declares with joy that they were not ignorant of the truth, but they knew it and were able to detect the sophistries of Antichrist. But I need not refer to the sacred oracles. It is enough for any one to look abroad, and note the influences which control

thought and determine conduct in the world. Men effect very little in the pastorate, unless sustained by intelligent piety in their churches; and those who succeed, by the grace of God, in transferring their own knowledge, and infusing their own spirit into a considerable number of their flock, act through them far more powerfully than they could alone. They are living many lives, and speaking with many voices. Their principles are set forth by example and advocated in speech, not merely in the praying circle, but also by the sacred hearthstone and in the marts of trade, and the spreading waves of their influence will never cease to bless mankind.

But however important a knowledge of theology and kindred branches of truth may be to Christian pastors, it is still a question with some whether this knowledge should be sought in schools of sacred learning, or by private study with able ministers of the word. It is here and there intimated that theological seminaries are a mistake; that Princeton and Andover and Union, Newton, Hamilton and Rochester, have taken the place of better agencies for ministerial training, and have hindered the progress of truth in the world. The paths which lead young men to these schools are not, it is remarked, "the old paths," and their profiting would be more manifest were they to spend a year or two with some laborious pastor, rich in experience and full of practical wisdom. How extensively this view prevails I do not profess to know, but a respectable number of our brethren may be presumed to entertain it. I shall therefore venture to add a few words on theological schools, laying down the proposition.

II. That these schools do, on the whole, afford the best means for gaining a knowledge of doctrinal theology, and indeed for ministerial education in general, within our reach. In saying this I do not pronounce them to be perfect in administration, or even in plan. I do not affirm the buildings to be in all cases commodious, or the libraries sufficient; much less do I claim for all the teachers superlative excellence. But no considerate man will object to theological schools on such grounds as these. He might as well deny that, on the whole, Christian churches afford the best means of cultivating

piety, on the ground that meeting-houses are sometimes incommodious and pastors unskilful. Such evils are not peculiar to any one method of discipline. They relate to administration and not to principle. To remove them, buildings may be erected, libraries enlarged, and teachers changed.

But, if any brother desire it, I will also admit that the plan and range, and end of labor in these schools may not be in all respects the wisest and best possible. Too much time may be given to one branch of study, and too little to another. Theology may encroach on interpretation, or interpretation on theology. The head may be taught and the tongue neglected, or the tongue may be trained and the heart forgotten. Human wisdom will never so perfectly balance and adjust the influences brought to bear on students for the ministry, as to give them the best conceivable culture in every direction, in thought, reason, imagination, speech, feeling and taste. To quicken the religious sensibilities and secure for them a free and full expression; to bring the imagination into vigorous use without permitting it to disturb the relations of truth; to stimulate and employ the reason, making it at the same time the ally of faith and the servant of a renewed will; to keep the mind alert, the heart open, the conscience tender; to fill the soul with enthusiasm for a lowly, self-denying, but glorious work; to call into action every power for good, and repress every tendency to evil, and to put the student in possession of all possible resources for the mission before him, is a task which no body of men yet in the flesh can be supposed to perform. Yet, until this be done—until the work of teachers and students be so directed as to bring out in due proportion all the powers of man for good, and be performed with a zeal and force answerable to the vast interests at stake, there will be opportunity for criticism on the part of all who distrust these schools, and reason for humility on the part of those who conduct them. And should they ever, in a single instance, become faultless in plan and conduct, I will venture to say that the graduates of this one perfect school would disappoint many of the churches. Not all of them would be mighty in the Scriptures, wise in counsel and eloquent in

speech. For much depends on original endowment; much on the measure of faith bestowed by Christ; and much on previous influences and effort. It is still true, as in the days of Paul, that God often chooses the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the mighty, and things which are not to bring to naught things that are; that no flesh should glory in his presence.

Besides, it has become evident that certain brethren need, in their own judgment, a pastor who has the best gifts, apostolic or even super-apostolic, and others also which are not mentioned in the Scriptures. They are fastidious about his stature, complexion and voice. They expect him to be grounded in faith and truth, apt to teach, prudent, temperate, hospitable, with a good report of them that are without; but also, and especially, that he be attractive in person and bearing; that he walk worthy of their church and society, to all pleasing; and that he be unto them as a lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice and can play well on an instrument. They admit piety and knowledge to be desirable, but so likewise, though perhaps in a lower degree, is a beautiful hand. Let it, however, be remembered, that Christ does not call men to the ministry as Frederick of Prussia selected them for his tall regiment. Hence, no theological school will be able to adjust the bodily proportions of its alumni to the tastes of these brethren.

But while I am ready to acknowledge the imperfection of theological schools, and to hope for their improvement, I esteem them the best means of ministerial training within our reach, and a great blessing to the churches. What young men need, in addition to the grace of God, before undertaking the high duties of their calling, is, first, a knowledge of Biblical interpretation, of doctrinal theology, of church history, and of pastoral duty in the largest sense of this expression; and, secondly, a proper discipline of their powers in the use of this knowledge.

I will not impeach the understanding of my hearers by going about to prove that theological schools do more to aid

one in attaining this knowledge than could be done by a single pastor. It would be absurd to doubt that three or four men, devoting themselves with zeal to particular branches of sacred study, must be able to communicate more knowledge than one man giving his attention for the most part to other labors.

When we bear in mind the peculiar character of the Scriptures, their many writers living in different ages and scenes; their varieties of style, narrative, preceptive, hortatory, argumentative, poetic, prophetic; their interdependence and unity as records prepared by inspired men and making known the will of God; and their relation to the pastor's work as his text-book and message, it would seem that he should have the best possible aid in learning to interpret them, the aid of one whose time and strength were consecrated to Biblical study. So, too, when we consider the vast fields which lie before the theologian; his premises imbedded in the Sacred Oracles from Genesis to Revelation, and not to be found without patient study; his analysis and synthesis laid up in the laws of thought, traversing the wide domain of mental science; his terminology, in the history of Christian dogmas, stretching back to the second century; and when we remember the close connection which obtains between the clearness, stability and correctness of one's doctrinal views and his usefulness in the ministry, it would seem no less evident that he should have the best help in studying this noble science, the help of one who gives his days and nights to Christian theology. Again: if we turn our thoughts to the history of Christian life, and observe the mass of records from which the knowledge of any one period of this history must be drawn-records pertaining to discussions, councils, creeds; to religious institutions, societies, modes of action; to Christian art, poetry and symbols; to education, domestic life and social worship; to fasts, festivals and holy days; to heresies, reforms, persecutions; to eminent teachers, marked providences, and the connection of Church and State; and if we recollect that this history, stretching over a space of nearly two thousand years, describes the mediatorial reign of Christ, and bears clusters of truth richer than those on the millennial vine of Papias, it would seem that a few of these ripe clusters should be culled by a skilful gardener and put in the pastor's hand for the refreshment of his own soul and the church of God. No less important is the sphere of pastoral duty, be it in the pulpit, the vestry, or the chamber of sickness,-with the convicted sinner, the troubled saint, or the carping backslider. Questions of order, of discipline, of charity, of principle, and of expediency-all things which concern the application of truth in the manifold relations of life, and with an eye to the greatest purity of the Church and good of men, belong to this branch of study, and deserve the best thoughts of the wisest teacher, of one who, in addition to experience, has made this department an object of special study. I do not, therefore, hesitate to say, that, in view of their contemplated work and of the time given to preparation, candidates for the sacred office need and should have the best instruction possible; nor will I withhold an expression of my belief, that our leading schools of theology do furnish instruction far more thorough and reliable than could be given by any single pastor. In this respect their utility should never be questioned. If they fail in this respect, it must be due to the grossest incompetency, or unfaithfulness on the part of teachers. And Christian knowledge, be it observed, is the first object of pursuit in ministerial education. To seek it with a proper aim is the most wholesome mental and spiritual discipline. It increases one's faith, humility, love of truth, and power to grasp and wield it in the service of the church.

It would here be in place for me to urge the benefits which may be derived from the use of a large and well selected library, but I forbear.

Permit me, however, to remind you of the advantage to a minister of Jesus of associating intimately, for a time, with fifty or sixty brethren, who are to be fellow-laborers with him in the gospel. Many who are now covered with the dust of toil can bear witness to the comfort and strength which they owe to friendships formed in the Seminary, and many more

to the precious results in their own characters of fraternal friction with students preparing for the ministry. The influence of pious young men upon one another, as they are putting on their armor for the conflict already in sight, is very quickening and salutary, and it will appear at the last day that many preachers of the holy gospel made greater progress in the divine life while at the Seminary than during any equal period of their earthly course. It is my deliberate conviction that the piety of theological students does very often keep pace with their increasing knowledge, so that they will remember their "school of the prophets" quite as thankfully for spiritual as for mental good.

But, after all, some one will say, there remains a serious objection to theological schools. They are not practical. They do not enable students to improve their gifts. can never learn to preach in the closet. Were these young men to read theology with a pastor, he would call upon them now and then to stand in his pulpit, and still oftener to conduct an evening service; and their increase of practical skill would more than compensate them for the knowledge which they would forego. This objection is plausible. But when it is recollected that our institutions are generally in or near large cities; that facilities for rapid travel to remote points are abundant; that feeble and destitute churches are in the habit of sending for students to supply their pulpits; that all may labor in Sabbath schools and take part in social meetings if they will; and that during a long vacation they may engage in preaching or in missionary effort, the force of this objection seems to be broken, and it may well be doubted whether students would have as many opportunities to anticipate in part the duties of their future calling, with a pastor, as they now do at the Seminary.

It is quite possible, however, that besides a full course of study in the Seminary, many students would do well to spend a few months with a pastor, before undertaking the responsibilities of the gospel ministry over a church, especially if they are still young and without much experience in public labor.

Let me urge you, therefore, my brethren, to give your hearty support to the cause of ministerial education. Befriend the institutions and the young men to whom the churches are looking for faithful pastors. After good natural parts.—a sound mind and aptness to teach,—the first qualification for the ministry, is deep piety; the second, a call from God to enter upon this work; and the third, education in its best sense, culminating in a thorough study of divine truth. It is our blessed privilege to be laborers together with Christ in securing for those who follow us the third qualification. If the great Shepherd and Bishop of Souls calls some to be preachers of his gospel in early life, He calls them as He did the twelve apostles, to be taught step by step, as they are able to bear it, until at length they are no longer novices, but well instructed, and, like their Divine Lord, have in some degree the tongue of the learned, that they may know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary. Let no doubts or scruples hinder you from aiding them in acquiring the discipline and knowledge needed for their work. And may God, in his infinite mercy, add his blessing to your labors. Amen.

ARTICLE IV .- RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Notices are necessarily omitted for want of space.

A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe. By John William Draper, M. D., LL. D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York; Author of a "Treatise on Human Physiology," &c., &c. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.

The Constitutional History of England, since the Accession of George Third, 1760-1860. By Thomas Erskine May, C. B. In two volumes. Volume I. Volume II. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1862.

- Memoir of the Life and Character of the late Hon. Theo. Freling-Huysen, LL. D. By Talbot W. Chambers, a Minister of the Collegiate Church, New York. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.
- The Capital of the Tycoon: A Narrative of a Three Years' Residence in Japan. By Sir Rutherford Alcock, K. C. B., Her Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in Japan. With maps and numerous illustrations. In two volumes. Volume I. Volume II. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.
- Praying and Working; Being some account of what Men can do when in earnest. By the Rev. WILLIAM FLEMING STEVENSON. Dublin. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 1863.
- The Social Condition and Education of the People in England. By Joseph Kay, Esq., M. A., of Trinity College, Cambridge; Barrister at Law; and late Travelling Bachelor of the University of Cambridge. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.
- Woman and her Saviour in Persia. By a returned Missionary. With fine illustrations, and a map of Nestorian Country. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1863.
- Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838, 1839. By Frances Anne Kemble. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.
- The Bivouac and the Battle-Field; or, Campaign Sketches in Virginia and Maryland. By George F. Noves, Captain U. S. Volunteers. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.
- Science for the School and Family. Part I. National Philosophy. By Worthington Hooker, M. D., Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine in Yale College; Author of "Human Physiology," "Child's Book of Nature," "Natural History," &c. "Illustrated by nearly 300 engravings. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.
- The Fruit Garden; A Treatise intended to explain and illustrate the Physiology of Fruit Trees, the Theory and Practice of all operations connected with the Propagation, Transplanting, Pruning, and Training of Orchard and Garden Trees, as Standards, Dwarfs,

Pyramids, Espaliers, etc.; the laying out and arranging different kinds of Orchards and Gardens; the selection of suitable varieties for different purposes and localities, gathering and preserving fruits, treatment of Diseases, destruction of insects, descriptions and uses of implements, etc. Illustrated with upwards of 150 figures, representing different parts of trees, all practical operations, forms of trees, designs for plantations, implements, etc. By P. Barry, of the Mt. Hope Nurseries, Rochester, New York. Rochester: Published by the author. 1863.

- C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina et Jugurtha. Recognovit Geo. Long, M. A. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.
- Xenophontis Anabasis. Recensuit J. F. Macmichael, A. B. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.
- I will be a Soldier. A Book for Boys. By Mrs. L. C. TUTHILL. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1863.
- The Young Purson. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1863.
- Romola. A Novel. By George Eliot, Author of "Adam Bede," "The Mill on the Floss," "Scenes of Clerical Life," and "Silas Marner." With illustrations. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.
- Peter Carradine, or the Martindale Pastorate. By CAROLINE CHESE-BRO. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1863.
- Sea-Kings, and Naval Heroes. A Book for Boys. By John G. Edgar, Author of "History for Boys," "Boyhood of Great Men," "Footprints of Famous Men," "Wars of the Roses," etc., etc. Illustrated by C. Keene and E. K. Johnson. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1863.

ERRATA.

In the October Number, 1862, on pages 560 and 566, for John Russell, read John Buzzell; on page 568, for C. K. Bacheler, read O. R. Bacheler; on page 572, for S. K. Moulton, read A. K. Moulton.

INDEX TO THE TWENTY-EIGHTH VOLUME.

ÆSTHETICS; or, The Science of Beau-Colenso, Bishop J. W., his Pentateuch ty, by Prof. John Bascom, noticed, 331

AFRICAN HUNTING, by Wm. C. Baldwin, noticed, 335.

ALMANAC, NATIONAL, noticed, 333.

AMERICAN BOARD of Commissioners, the Missions of, article on, by Rev. A. N. Arnold, 341; results of fifty years, 342; increasing receipts, 344-5, provision for disabled missionaries and missionaries' children, 346-7; average duration of missionary life, 348; missionary schools and their value, 349; Catholic spirit of the Board, false claims, 350-7; change in the moral aspect of the world since the origin of the A. B. C. F. M., 358.

ANDREWS, S. J., his Life of ourLord, noticed, 324.

BASCOM, Prof. John, his Æsthetics, no- D'AUBIGNE, J. H. MERLE, his History ticed, 331.

BETHUNE, Rev. Dr. G. W., his Memoirs of his Mother, noticed, 154.

Brace, Chas. L., his Races of the Old World, noticed, 492.

BURTON, JOHN H., his Book-Hunter, noticed, 157.

BUSHNELL'S, DR., ARGUMENTS FOR IN-FANT BAPTISM, reviewed by Rev. Irah Chase, 501; Dr. B.'s idea of organic connection, examined, 501-9; Jewish proselyte baptism, and the conversation with Nicodemus, 510-20; the supposition that on the day of Pentecost, the Apostle Peter proclaimed an institute which he himself did not then think of, but which. at a later period, was properly developed, 521-8; the reception of young children by our Lord, and apostolic authority, 529-39; early church history, 540; Justin Martyr, 541-3; Irenæus, 544; Tertullian, 545; Origen, 546; shepherd of Hermas, 547-9; inscriptions on the monuments of children in the Catacombs, 550-9; Cyprian and Council of Carthage, 560-1: Ambrose, 562; Pelagius and Augustine, 564-75; infant baptism and infant communion: testimony of the Fathers, 576-9; of Romish authors, 580-2; of the Council of Trent, 583-4; of the Greek Church, 585-6; the arguments that disprove infant communion disprove infant baptism, 587 -9; infant baptism and infant church DRAPER, Dr. JOHN W., his History of membership, 590-611.

CHAMPLIN, Pres. J. T., his text-books rope, noticed of Intellectual Philosophy, and Eth-EMANCIPATION, RESULTS OF, by Auics, noticed, 330.

COOK, JOEL, his Siege of Richmond, no-FRANCE, the Students, History of, ticed, 334.

and Book of Joshua critically examined, reviewed, by Rev. O. S. Stearns, 464; attention excited by it accounted for, 464-5; no danger from it to the thoughtful, and informed, 466; nothing new in it, 467-71; an exception, 472; testimony of Christ and his apostles to the Pentateuch, 473; evidence for the credibility of the Pentateuch, 474; the Bishop's method, 475; state of the Hebrew text, 476; the Bishop's difficulty as to the "harnessed men" who went out of Egypt at the Exodus, 477; Keil's explanation, 477-8; the Bishop's trouble about supplies for people and cattle in the desert, 478; good that will be accomplished by the book, 479-80.

of the Reformation in the time of Calvin, noticed, 491.

DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY FOR CHRISTIAN PASTORS, an article on, by Prof. A. Hovey, 645; pastors are also teachers, and should be well instructed, 646-7; special objections to instruction in doctrinal theology, 647; defence of the position that doctrinal theology is exceedingly desirable for Christian pastors, 647-8; demanded by their rational nature, 648-50; it meets a want of their moral nature, 650-2; essential to their spiritual good, 652 -3; when and how truth should be brought before the mind, 654; pastors should be well grounded in theology for the good of their people, 655; needed to save the ungodly, 656; Dr. Wayland's idea of preaching commented on, 657-9; pastors should feed the church, 659-60; should instruct it in truth for its spiritual growth, 661; to augment its influence, 662; theological schools the best place for ministerial education, 663; the plan and range of study adopted may not be the best possible, 664; the preparation needed better furnished in theological schools than elsewhere, 665-6; benefits of association with future fellow-laborers, 667; objection that the schools are not practical, 668; conclusion, 669.

the Intellectual Development of Eu-

gustin Cochin, noticed, 155.

noticed, 154.

673 INDEX.

GASPARIN, DE COUNT, his Les Perspectives du Temps Présent, noticed, 481. GASPARIN, MADAME DE, the Countess, her Vesper, noticed, 160.

GAUSSEN, Prof. L., his Canon of the Holy Scriptures, examined in the light of History, noticed, 148.

GLACIERS, THE, OF THE ALPS; The origin and phenomena of Glaciers, by John Tyndall, reviewed, by 1100.
Chester; Dewey, 297 the névé or snow-fields, 297; dimensions and GREEN, Prof. WM. H., his Pentateuch vindicated from the aspersions of vindicated from the aspersions of Colorse noticed, 325. direction of the glaciers, 298; origin of the name Mer de Glace, 298, 9; the debris deposited on the glaciers, GUTHRIE, Rev. THOMAS, his Speaking to 300; the Alps formerly colder than at present, 300; granite blocks with ice pedestals on glaciers, 301; Tyn-Hamilton, Rev. James, his Sunday dall's account of the formation of Evening Book, and A Morning beside the Mer de Glace, 302; depth of a nels of glaciers, 303; the first American that ascended Mt. Blanc, 304; HARRIS, Lieut. WM. C., his Prison Life motion of a glacier, 304; variations of velocity in different parts, 305; mond, noticed, 334. experiment of Profs. Agassiz and Hopkins, Pres. Mark, his Lectures on Forbes, 306; experiment of Tyndall tortuosity of the valleys on the motion, 306-8; experiments to determine the velocity at different depths, 309: also the motion of the ice in winter, 309-10; crevasses, fractures, and caverns, 310, 11; dirt-bands of the Mer de Glace, 311-2; cause of the motion of glaciers, 3!2; six theories 313-17; experiments with ice and results, 318; Tyndall's summary of facts and conclusions on the constitution and action of glaciers, 320; insufficient importance attached to the infiltrating water, 320-2; influence of temperature, 323.

GREEK CHURCH, THE, Alexander de Stourdza on, by Rev. A. N. Arnold, 31; introductory note, 31-2; statement of the controversy between the Eastern and Western Churches, Part I., 32; doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit, 33; existence of purgatory, 34; communion in both kinds, 34; immersion and triple immersion in baptism, 35; use of leavened or unleavened bread in the communion, 36; definition of the primacy of the See of Rome, 37-39; claim of catholicity, 40; not to confound eternal religion with temporal civilization, 41; Part II., statement of the controversy between the Orthomation of the xvith century, 42; the reformation Rome's expiation of the first schism, 42; appeal of the Protestant theologians of Tübingen to the Eastern Church, 43; principal points in controversy, 44; faith and good works as conditions of salvation, 44-7; eucharist, 48; doctrine of the authority of the church and on the sacred traditions, 49-51; the worship due to the holy cross, the Virgin Mary, angels, and saints, 52-55: worship paid to the holy images and the holy relics, 56-58; religious fasts instituted by the Church, 58-9; state

Bishop Colenso, noticed, 325.

the Heart; or Sermons for the People, noticed, 485.

Evening Book, and A Morning beside the Lake of Galilee, noticed, 326.

glacier, 303; the "moulins" or fun-HARPER'S LIBRARY OF SELECT NOVELS noticed, 493.

in the Tobacco Warehouse at Rich-

Moral Science, noticed, 328-30.

to determine the influence of the INFANT SALVATION, article on, by Rev. H. C. Townley, 416; the large proportion of the race that die in infancy, 416; brief statement and review of leading opinions on the doctrine of Infant Salvation, 417; view that only the baptized are saved, 417 -20: that all infants are saved because all are innocent, 420-22; that infants have no existence beyond the present life, 422-3; that the infants of believers, dying before they have committed actual sin, are saved, while all others are lost, 423-4; examination of I. Cor. vii: 14, 424-6; Scripture evidence that none are lost by the unbelief of their parents, 426-7; the opinion that the doctrine of election logically implies the damnation of infants, 427-9; the teaching of the Scriptures, 430; infants incapable of rejecting the gospel, 430-1; the resurrection of the bodies of infants a strong presumption of their salva-tion, 432; the Scriptures teach that the guilt entailed upon the race by the first Adam (infants included) was removed by the atoning death of the second Adam, 433; different emotions of David on the death of an infant son and of Absalom 434-5; conclusion that all infants are saved by the merits of Christ, 435.

dox (Greek) Church and the Refor-IRVING, Rev. EDWARD, THE LIFE OF, by Mrs. Oliphant, reviewed by Rev. Heman Lincoln, 234; England's indebtedness to the intellect of Scot-land, 234-5; defects of Mrs. Oliphant's work, 235; Irving's parents and birthplace, 236-7; his great

strength and impetuous temper, 237 -8; his course at the University of Edinburgh, 238-9; his theological studies and life as a teacher, 239-40; early clerical prospects not cheering, 240; removal to Edinburgh, 241; becomes colleague with Dr. Chalmers, 241-2; his labors among the poor of Glasgow, 242-3; nobleness of his nature, 243; removal to London and high hopes, 244; his great industry, 245; cause of his sudden popularity, 245-6; results of his preaching, 246-7; his popularity not the occasion of his fall, 247; his want of tact and knowledge of men and occasions, 248-9; his waning influence in London. 247; infatuation in the study of prophecy, 250; his views of the incarnation, atonement, and infant baptism, 250-1; his notion of the Spirit's continued miraculous power in the Church, and its results, 251-2; trouble from the London Presbytery and General Assembly, 252; rejected by the trustees land elders of his church, and ordination revoked by Presbytery of Annan, 254; deposed from pastorship by the prophets of his own church. 245; visit to Scotland, and death, 246; mystery of his life, 256; two causes of his failure, 257-8; instructiveness of his example, 259.

IRVING, WASHINGTON, his Life and Letters by Pierre Irving, noticed.

JEWISH CHURCH, LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF THE, by Prof. A. P. Stanley, noticed, 488.

KORAN, THE, a new edition of a trans-

deemer, noticed,

LANGUAGE, THE ORIGIN OF, article on, MACDUFF, Rev. J. R., his Thoughts of by Prof. Oscar Howes, 383; the ques-God, noticed, 326. tion inevitable, 383; paucity of facts, 384-5; speech the distinguishing characteristic of man, 385; theories: the onomatopoetic and development, 386-9; the instinctive theory and its advocates, Marsh, Müller, Kendrick, 389-92; facts opposed to the instinctive theory. 392-8; Müller's theory of roots, 398-9; Dr. Kendrick's endorsement, 400; theory of the supernatural origin of language, 400 necessities which this theory alone MILLER, HUGH, his Tales and Sketches, satisfies, 401-2; statement of the probable facts of the origin, 402-3: MILLENNIUM, THE, OF THE BIBLE, artendencies of thought illustrated by ticle on, by Rev. Heman Lincoln, the last three and leading theories, 403-6.

LANGUAGE, THE SCIENCE OF, Lectures on, by Max Müller, reviewed by Prof. A. C. Kendrick, 1; the science challenges our profoundest interest

and study, 1; recent origin of the science, 2; its claims to be called a science vindicated, 3; is it one of the natural sciences ? 4-5; the two great laws of phonetic decay and dialectical regeneration, 6-8, comparative inferiority of written to oral language, 8-9; language historical, 10-11; reasons for the recent origin of the science of language, 12-13; its progress, 14-15; labors of the Jesuit Hervas, Sir Wm. Jones, the Humboldts, and others, 15-17; fruits of their studies; genealogical classification, 18-19; origin of tense and case endings, 19.20; original roots, three classes, 21; the doctrine of roots ap-plied to classification, 22; morpho-logical classification, 23; origin of language, 23-4; theories, 25-6; language a necessary product of man's rational constitution, 26-7: this theory explains the origin of roots, 28-9; the real origin of language hidden and mysterious, 30.

AW IN RELATION TO MIRACLES, article on, by J. M. Hoyt, 612; man's limited and imperfect knowledge, 612-13; definition of law, 613-14; uniform action suggests law, and law lawgiver, 615 pantheism, 616; a miracle defined, 617-18; a miracle neither without law nor against, but in a higher plane of law, 619-20; no reasoning about miracles with an atheist, 621; to a theist miracles are natural though above experience, 622; puerility of the objection that miracles are incredible because extraordinary, 623-5; law in its essence, 626; man's presumption and needed

humility, 627-8.

lation of, noticed, 327.

KRUMMACHER, F. W., his Risen Re-Lefebyre René (Edouard Laboulaye,) his Paris in America, noticed, 496.

MACLEOD, Rev. NORMAN, his Parish Pa-

pers, noticed, 487.

MARSH, GEO. P., his Origin and History of the English Language and of the early Literature it embodies, noticed, 156.

Mason, Rev. F., his Burmah, its People and Natural Productions, noticed, 332. MASON, S. W., his Manual of Gymnastic Exercises for schools and families, noticed, 494.

noticed, 495.

131; Pagan and Jewish conceptions of golden ages, past and to come, 131; belief in a Millennium in the early church, 132-3; Old Testament predictions of a happy age, 132-3; the New Testament refers to the second advent of Christ as certain and to be eagerly expected, 133-5; the New Testament leaves no place for a Millennium between the second advenof Christ and the final judgment. 135-9; the world will not be filled with true Christians at the second advent of Christ, 139-40; nor will there be any Millennium on the earth before the judgment, 141-44.

MILTONIC DEITY, THE, article on, by J. W. Stearns, 629; Dante's vision of the great poets in the Inferno, 629; Prof. Draper's estimate of the influence of the Paradise Lost, 630; difficulties encountered in the Paradise Lost greater than those of the Inferno, 631-2; inconsistencies in both poems. 632; Milton true to Scripture in his representations of spirits, 633-4; difficulty of representing Deity, 634-5: Homer's gods, 635; third book of Paradise Lost falls below its subject. 636-7; reasons for its inferiority, 638 -40; similar defects in the fifth book, 541; incongruities of the battle of the angels 642; results to which foregoing considerations lead us; Paradise Lost to be read not as a text-book in Theology, but as a poem, 643; its spirit eminently religious, 644; Deity

not materialized, 645. MIRACLES OF CHRIST, articles on, by Prof. Alvah Hovey, 64; a miracle defined, 64; miracles not improbable, 64-5; Hume's objection to their credibility on the ground of the known spuriousness of many alleged miracles, 65-6; Powell's objection from the constancy of natural causes, 66-8; the objection that the laws of nature are inviolable because divine, 68-72; the naturalistic and mythical hypotheses, 72; the miracles of Christ divided into those wrought on human nature, and those on the material world, 73; those on human nature: healing mortal sicknesses, 73; healing of the nobleman's son specially examined, 73-8; healing of Peter's wife and mother, 79-81; Christ's vicarious suffering in the healing of diseases, 82; healing of a man, who had the dropsy, and of the centur-ion's servant, 83-4; healing of chronic diseases, 85; of the paralytic, 85-90; miracles on the material world: miracles of absolute control, 186; the draught of fishes, Luke v: 1-11, 186 -9; a second draught, John xxi: 1 sq., 189-91; the tribute money in the noticed, 492. fish's mouth, 191-3; the stilling of Mosaic Tabernacle and Worship, the tempest, 193-5; Christ walking on the water, 195-8; judgment of the fruitless fig-tree, 198-202: miracles of creative power: the changing of water into wine, 202-6; the miracu-

lous feeding of the five thousand, 205 -9; the feeding of the four thousand, 210-12; miracles on his own body: the transfiguration, 212-15; the resurrection, 215-18; the twelve manifestations of himself by Christ after his resurrection, 218-26; testimony afforded by the records of Christ's miracles, 226; number and integrity of the witnesses, 227; their powers of observation and memory, 228; the phenomena attested were sensible, and the testimony positive, 229; testimony of the evangelists independent and harmonious, 230; Christ's miracles inseparably interwoven with his teachings, 231; their aim godlike, 231-2; great evidential value of miracles, 233.

MOHAMMEDAN SYSTEM, THE, in its religious aspects and tendencies, article on, by Pres. G. W. Samson, 161; pres-ent interest in the subject, 152; works relating to it, 162-3; Mohammed's visit to Jerusalem at twelve years of age, 163-4; his early knowledge of Christianity, 165-6; his marriage, 167; influence on him of his wife's cousin, Woraka, 167-8; sympathy and influence of his wife, 168; preparation of the Arabians for Mohammed's teachings, 168-70; his first vision at the age of forty, 171; gradual growth of his influence, 171-2; his professed night journey to Jerusalem and heaven, 172-4; the hegira, 174; his successes, 175; the visions composing the Koran, 176; analysis of the Koran, 177-8; source of the true knowledge of God, 179-80; evidence on which Mohammed rests his claims of inspiration, 181-3; manner of receiving his revelations, 183-4; the divine unity his special doctrine, 185; his denial of Christ's divinity, 360; attributes, works and providence of God, 361-3; negative views of man's character and of redemption, 364; denial of the sacrificial death of Christ, 364-7; grossness of his views of the future state, 368-72; his moral code, 372-3; statutes relating to domestic society, 374-7; slaves, 377; general social and civil duties, 378-9; duties of religion, 379; prayer, 380; pilgrimage to Mecca, 381; preparation of the Arab and Persian for the gospel, 381-2; an incident in the writer's experience, 382-3.

MOORE, FRANK, his Rebellion Record,

THE, SIGNIFICANCE OF, article on, by Rev. D. B. Ford, 406; the tabernacle and its enclosure, 406-7; contents of the tabernacle, 408-9; manner of sacrifice, 409-10; who might enter

ments, the sanctuary and the holy of holies, 411-13; the ark of the covenant, 414-16.

NOYES, Prof. G. R., his Collection of Theological Essays, noticed. 483. PENMANSHIP, THEORY AND ART OF,

noticed, 495.

PHELPS, Rev. S. D., his Holy Land with glimpses of Europe and Egypt,

Nicholas Murray, noticed, 151.

PULPIT INSTRUCTION, VARIETY IN, article on, by Rev. Wm. C. Child, 436; the pulpit the minister's peculiar sphere, 437; his solicitude, 438; sphere, 437; his solicitude, 438; demand for variety, 439; difference between apostolic times and our own, 440-2; fundamental truths alone not sufficient, 442-4; truth and its relations defined, 445-8; mere science not for the pulpit, 448-9; complex nature of man and relations of Christian doctrines to it. 450-2; doctrines and practice, 454-5; relation of truth to conscience and the sensibilities, 456-7; need of experimental preaching, 457; abundant topics for the pulpit, 458; on what variety and copiousness in the pulpit are dependent, 459-63.

RICHARDS, Mrs. C. H. B., her Springs of Action, noticed, 151.

RUSSELL, WM. HOWARD, his North and South, noticed, 333.

SAVAGE, Rev. E., his Church Discipline, noticed, 149.

SAWYER, L. A., his Reconstruction of Biblical Theories, noticed, 145.

SIN, THE PENALTY OF, article on, by Rev. S. R. Mason, 113; definition of penalty, 113-15; penalty threatened to Adam, 115; penalty distinguished from consequences, 116-17; the theological axiom that " the penalty of sin is death, natural, spiritual and eternal," examined, 118-19; is death as a penalty for sin ascertained from the Scriptures to be death spiritual, and finally death eternal? 120-30.

LETTERS OF THE REV. JOHN. a Presbyterian minister, to his brother, the Rev. Peter Smith, a Methodist preacher, noticed, 326.

SMITH, WILLIAM, his Principia Latina noticed, 333.

the tabernacle, 411; the two apart-Stanley. Prof. A. P., his Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, noticed, 488.

STEFFENS, HEINRICH, his Story of my Career, as student at Freiburg and Jena, and as professor at Halle, Breslau, and Berlin, noticed, 489.

STILLÉ, C. J., his Pamphlets How a Free People conduct a long war, and Northern Interests and Southnoticed, 496.

PRIME, Rev. S. I., his Memoirs of Rev. SZABAD, EMERIC, his Modern War; its

Theory and Practice, noticed, 495.

UNIVERSITY SERMONS, article on, by Rev. R. Babcock, 91; such sermons no novelty, 92; grandeur of the aim and the adventitious aids in such preaching, 92-4; mistaken attempts at special adaptation, 95; sermons of Dr. Arnold of Rugby, 96-100; of Dr. Wayland, 101-4; Dr. Huntington. 105-9; of Horace Mann, 110-12; of Dr. Walker, 112-13.

WAYLAND, Rev. F., his Letters on the Ministry of the Gospel, noticed, 487. not abstractions, 453; relation of creed Winslow, Rev. Octavius, his Sympathy of Christ with Man, and his Patriarchal Shadows of Christ, and his

Church, noticed, 485.

WOLFF, Rev. PHILLIPPE, his Baptism, the Covenant and the Family, reviewed, by Prof. A. C. Kendrick, 260; spirit and temper of the book, 260-2; Baptists appeal to the scholarship of the Protestant world, 263; the author's chapter on the Baptisms of water and of the spirit, 264; that on the Fathers, 264-5; his denial that John Baptist, or the Apostles practised immersion, 265-7; views of the reformers, 267-8; assertion that baptism means to drown, 269; argument from the classics, 270-1; from the Septuagint, 272-3; from the New Testament, 274-8; caricature of the Pentecost Baptisms, 279; of the baptism of the eunuch, 280-3; testimony of the scholars of Christendom, 284 6; subject of baptism, 287; quarrel with his own denomination, 287-8; his position that baptism precedes faith, 289-90; his defense of infant baptism, 291; household baptisms, 290-2; the author's caricatures and ribald coarseness, 293-5. WORSHIP, A MANUAL OF, noticed, 327.

